File
1

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE ORIGINS OF THE PRE-DEUTERONOMIC ELEMENTS OF THE HISTORICAL CORPUS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

GALE RITZ

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST, 1938

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer acknowledges his debt of gratitude to Dr. W. C. Graham, his faculty adviser, for his wise counsel and direction during the course of this study. From him came the suggestion of the problem and the lines along which the solution might be found.

PREFACE

By historical Corpus is meant the body of literature, Genesis to Kings. The Pre-Deuteronomic elements are the Sources commonly designated J and E. The term "origins" as here used has a much wider connotation than merely the place and date of the publication of a writing. It means rather the social situation out of which the literature emerged and the function it was designed to serve in that situation. The problem, then, of the present study will be to determine at what stages in the life of the Hebrews, that life viewed as an evolving social process, J and E appeared and what the social motivations were that underlay their production.

The investigation has, of course, definite literary aspects. One of the purposes of the study is the discovery of the places J and E occupy in the evolution of Hebrew literature. The extent of these sources, their analyses, their unity or lack of unity, the relation they bear to each other and to other parts of the Corpus are problems that must be solved if we are to determine the ideology and psychology of their authors and their respective social provinces. The methods and results already achieved by what may be designated literary criticism must be accorded full credit. But if one is justified at all in re-opening such a question, one may be permitted to hold those results in abeyance that the problem may be approached from as fresh a viewpoint and with as little bias as possible. The proposed purpose of seeking to discover the social origins of J and E indicates that the emphasis in the investigation will be placed more on the cultural and social factors of the problem than on its literary aspects. When precedence in our methodology is given to such matters, it is altogether possible that some of the views heretofore held of the evolution of this literature may have to be substantially altered.

But after all, the literary features of such a study belong primarily to the realm of methodology and are of secondary character except for those students who regard the literature of the Old

Testament as of value for its literary excellencies alone. But when literature is viewed for what it actually is, namely, the deposit of a stream of human life which it reflects, literary techniques are but a means to the larger end of vitalizing the literature by letting the life it portrays come alive on its pages. Only in this way can literature be meaningful and serve the function that it is possible for it to fulfil. It is hoped that for these limited portions of Scripture under consideration, these ends can be accomplished, at least partially, by this study of their origins.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ii
PREFACE	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. CRITICISM OF THE WELLHAUSEN POSITION	19
II. THE JUDEAN HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE	39
III. THE THEOCRATIC STRAND	68
IV. CONCLUSION	119
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133

INTRODUCTION

The problem of J and E is a part of the larger problem of the entire historical corpus. The currently accepted solution of the problem of J and E is found in the so-called Wellhausen hypothesis.[1] Because of the integral relation of the immediate problem of J and E with the larger one, it will be well to reproduce at this point the major tenets of the Wellhausen reconstruction. This theory of the evolution of the literature of the early books of the Old Testament is, however, based on the so-called Hexateuch alone.[2] So far as can be discovered, the subject has never been treated from the standpoint of the entire corpus, Genesis to Kings.

Although familiar to every student of the Old Testament, it may be briefly stated that this theory, otherwise known as the documentary hypothesis, recognizes four distinct sources in the first six books of the Old Testament, each having had independent origin and circulation. J is the earliest source, dated 850 B.C. so designated from the prevalence of Yahweh as the name for deity. The next source is E, or Elohistic, appearing in 750 B.C. as an independent history of the Hebrew People and largely paralleling the J document. These designations are also conveniently used to signify the sections of Palestine where the authors are said to have lived and done their work and the sectional bias that is

---

[1] Ever since the publication in Germany in 1876 by Julius Wellhausen of his brilliant Prolegomena to the History of the Hebrew People (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892; translated J. Sutherland Black and Alan Menzies), the hypothesis bearing his name has enjoyed widespread popularity. Since Wellhausen's time practically every major work on the Old Testament has been based on this hypothesis. All the Introductions, as, for example, those of Cornill, Sellin, Driver, and others, as well as the vast literature that has grown up dealing with the "Hexateuch" and with individual books has presupposed the Wellhausen hypothesis.

[2] The term Hexateuch is here employed because of its current use in Old Testament critical terminology. It implies that the first six books of the Bible are a unity and are to be treated in exclusion from the rest of the historical corpus.

thought to dominate their productions, J referring to Judah and E to Ephraim.[1]

The next source is the Deuteronomic, characterized by the law of the single altar. The D contribution is contained in the book of Deuteronomy and in additions to the historical books by Deuteronomic editors. This source is dated about 650 B.C. or later, being written shortly before its "discovery" in the temple in 621. Many believe it was written ad hoc and within a short time before it became the basis of Josiah's reforms. The last important source is the Priestly, designated P, the main interest of which is the cultus. P was written in substantially its present form in the Early Fifth Century B.C.

The manner in which these squrces came to be united in their present form is perhaps the most interesting feature of this hypothesis. This has been accomplished, it is said, by editors, who finding these sources in existence, for reasons not adequately explained united them by a "scissors and paste" method. Such alleged editors are said to have retained in an arbitrary fashion sections, now from one source, now from another, and to have omitted at will what did not suit their rather vague purposes. The only original material we have from these editors are occasional harmonistic or editorial notes.[2]

The editor who thus united the J and E contributions is designated R^{JE}, his date being usually given as 700 B.C. The editor who accomplished in similar fashion, the union of the extant JE source and Deuteronomy did his work about 600 B.C. and is

---

[1]Summaries of the Wellhausen position may be found in numerous writings on the subject:

E. S. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch (New York and Cincinnati, 1918).

D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914).

Julius Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen bücher des Alten Testaments (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1899).

W. E. Addis, The Documents of the Hexateuch (London, 1893-1894).

[2]Says W. E. Addis, History of Criticism, p. lvii: "Accordingly we conclude that the Jahwist and Elohist were united by an editor who belonged neither to the school of Deuteronomy nor the P writer who had no direct concern either with the D or P code but who wrought independently."

designated R^{JED}. The last important step was taken by the editor who combined the priestly document with the JED work. He is dated 400 B.C. and designated R^{P}, the priestly editor.

Thus briefly stated, we have the so-called Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis before us. It is seen that this theory recognizes four main sources in the Hexateuch as well as the three briefer editorial strata $R^{JE\ JED\ P}$. But this is not all, some scholars have discovered secondary material in all the sources, designated J_2 E_2 etc., concluding that such additions were the work of "schools."[1]

There has been and probably still is widespread consensus of scholarship in favor of the main features of the "documentary" theory. These features may be said to be: The analysis of the books into the materials composing the leading documents, the fact of their independent origin and circulation,[2] the place and date of their appearance and the method of compilation by which their present form was reached. The solution offered in the Wellhausen hypothesis for the problem of J and E may be briefly summarized: With respect to J, the consensus is that the J material is confined to Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, and the first two chapters of Judges, with no J in Leviticus and probably none in Deuteronomy. The J material is found within these limits: Gen. 2: 46 and Jg. 2: 5. There is disagreement among scholars regarding J's unity as well as other features of the reconstruction, principally in regard to the possibility of the extent of J beyond Jg. 2: 5.[3]

J's aims are said to be ethical and religious.[4] He writes

---

[1]Cf. Ernst Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: G. H. Doran Company, 1923), pp. 61-73. Carl Heinrich Cornill, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), pp. 76-91.

[2]With reference to the D and P contributions, only the Deuternomic and Priestly codes: Book of Deut. or possibly the original code, Chaps. 5-26, and the P code, Ex. 35: 1--Leviticus--Num. 10: 28, are thought to have had separate circulation. The Deuteronomic and Priestly additions to the historical books proper are regarded as editorial expansions.

[3]Analysis of the Hexateuch into its constituent sources may be found in Brightman, op. cit.

[4]Ibid., pp. 23f; Simpson, op. cit., pp. 72f.

in order "to elevate and purify the ideals of the Nation." He has an interest in the solution of such problems as sin, evil, pain, labor, sickness, death, language, and the antithesis of the agriculturalist and the nomad. He is interested in mildly glorifying the Southern Kingdom but is not a narrow partisan, inasmuch as he has a friendly attitude to persons and places of North Israel. Critics are practically unanimous in locating J in the Southern Kingdom. The characteristic reasons offered are: J's interest in the sacred places of the South, especially Hebron; the fact that he pays special attention to the tribe of Judah, as is apparent in such sections as Gen. 38, 49, and Jg. 1, and the place of prominence given Judah in the Joseph story.

The date 850 B.C. given to J is based on internal evidences and historical and political allusions. The termini are first established. Both J and E are placed earlier than Deuteronomy because of the absence in both of the Deuteronomic idea of centralization of worship, and the Deuteronomic conceptions of the priesthood, ritual and theology. The date 621 B.C. becomes, therefore, the lower limit for both. A more accurate terminus ad quem for J is found in the prophets Amos and Hosea who represent a more advanced religious and ethical stage of thinking than that found in J. Therefore, J, it is argued, must have appeared before 750 B.C. The terminus a quo is fixed as the reign of solomon. Such an expression as "the Canaanite was then in the land"[1] was written at a time when Canaan was enslaved, an event of Solomon's reign. Futhermore, his references to the Kingdom[2] presuppose at least the times of David and Solomon. Accordingly, the two limits are established: the reign of Solomon (ca. 950 B.C.), and the date of the first writing prophets, 750 B.C. The date 750 B.C. is further strengthened by the comparison of J with E, the date 750 B.C. being accepted as that of E. The style and ideas of J are regarded as more primitive than those of E. hence J must be prior to E. J is said to have been written during a period of peace and prosperity; two reigns between the termini meet this condition, those of Solomon and Jehoshaphat. The majority of scholars settle on the reign of the latter because the religions

---

[1]Gen. 12: 6, 13: 7, Jg. 1: 21, 28--Canaan no longer a factor in Hebrew affairs. Gen. 9: 25-27.

[2]Gen. 36: 31, 49: 8-12, Num. 24: 18-19.

and moral ideas of J they regard as having more affinity with the period of Elijah than with conditions in the reign of Solomon. Accordingly, the date 850 B.C. is fixed for the Judean History.

When we come to E, we find the unity of the Elohistic source more in question than is the case with J. The majority of scholars distinguish E_1, and E_2.[1] The upper limit of the E document is placed at Genesis 15, where the Elohistic writer begins his narrative with the promise to Abraham, and the lower limit at Joshua 24, Joshua's farewell address. As in the case of J there are significant differences of opinion as to whether E carried his narrative beyond the book of Joshua.[2]

The aims of E are said to be religious. His work is described as the "history of the theocratic succession.[3] He desires to convey to his readers the idea that "God is the supreme ruler of Israel, her lawgiver, guiding her destinies from Abraham to the Promised Land." The motivation offered for E in the current theory is primarily religious. A political bias is also seen in E. The fact that the E narrative contains numerous references to Northern shrines,[4] graves,[5] and personages[6] have led critics to regard it as a Northern production written to meet the needs of Northern readers. The date of 750 B.C. in the reign of Jereboam II is arrived at for E in a manner similar to that in the dating of J.

---

[1]Kuenen was the first scholar to advocate secondary Elohistic material. His E_2 embraces the first Decalogue, the Golden Calf story, Ex. 32-33: 6, and Ex. 24: 1-2, 9-11; Ex. 33: 7-11; Ex. 19: 13b. This material he thinks is a prophetic reaction to the Northern cultus and emanates from Judah. Cf. Abraham Kuenen, An Historic-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (London: Macmillan & Company, 1886), pp. 61f. Cornill follows Kuenen, op. cit., pp. 76f.

[2]Koenig refuses to admit that the original J and E continue beyond Joshua. Moore, Cornill, and Budde, however, are emphatic in positing J and E material throughout the later books of the corpus. Eduard Koenig, Emileitung in Das Alte Testaments (Bonn: E. Weber, 1893), pp. 250f.

[3]S. R. Driver, Introduction to Literature of Old Testament (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1903), pp. 116f.

[4]Shrines: Mahanaim, Penuel, Shechem, Gen. 33: 19, 34, 35: 4, Josh. 24: 1, 25, 26, 32.

[5]Graves in E: Those of Deborah, Rachel, Joshua, Joseph, Eleazer, Gen. 35: 2, 19-20, 50: 24-25, Joshua 24: 30 and 33.

[6]Reuben, Joshua, Joseph are E's heroes.

The reign of Jereboam II receives further confirmation as the time of E's activity because, it is said, E gives evidence of having been written when the Northern Kingdom enjoyed a period of prosperity and predominance. Reference has already been made to the method of the formation of the JE book through the efforts of an editor who combined the two documents.

Such is the contribution of the currently accepted theory toward the solution of the problem of the origins of J and E.

At this point a brief survey[1] of the long course criticism has pursued in arriving at the Wellhausen position and the significant developments since that time, will be given. Nearly every introduction contains a sketch of this history. It is reproduced here to indicate the purely literary methodology employed by critics. It is our contention that some of the earlier critics held more tenable views on certain phases of the problem than those which comprise the Wellhausen theory with respect to those same phases. This will appear in the course of development of the study.

If an exact date were to be offered for the beginning of the modern critical movement, it may be said to be 1753, when the French Physician, Jean Astruc published his book on Genesis, in which he contended that sources had been used by Moses in composing that book. Before Astruc's time there had been dim flickerings of the light, but to little avail. The view of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, well established in New Testament times, was to prevail with hardly a dissenting voice until well after the Reformation. A factor in the persistence of this view was the slowness with which the development of the scientific method proceeded. The Renaissance and Reformation were tardy in bearing their fruitage of freedom of investigation, particularly in matters pertaining to religion. In fact, among large groups, the Reformation tended to enhance the authority of the written word. Authority previously vested in the Catholic hierarchy with its Papal head, the Protestants transferred to the Book.

Accordingly, the battle between science and religion raged, each thinking the other bent on its destruction. As has been too

---

[1] The sketch of the history of Pentateuchal Criticism here reproduced is based on that of F. C. Eiselen, The Books of the Pentateuch (New York and Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1916), pp. 43f. Cf. Simpson, op. cit., pp. 22f; Addis, op. cit., XIIIf.

frequently true, the forces of religion were their own enemies, bitterly opposing the movement that was to purify the very springs of religion.

Before Astruc's time the few dissenters from the accepted dogma were sporadic and ineffectual as indicated above. Rabbi Ibn Ezra,[1] writing in the twelfth century, discovered certain passages that could not be harmonized with Mosaic Authorship. Later, some of the Reformers argued along the same line discovering passages that could only have been written after Moses' death, but these, it was thought, were not numerous enough to destroy the prevailing view.[2] Spinoza[3] in the Seventeenth Century went farthest up to his time in attacking the current dogma, denying that the Scriptures constitute a direct divine revelation. Soon afterward, Richard Simon,[4] a Catholic Priest of Paris, presented a theory of the Pentateuch, surprisingly modern in some respects, in which he held that these books had grown up by accretions, the various sections coming from the record of official historiographers and later collected by Ezra.

But with Astruc[5] criticism took a new direction. It was the beginning of the use of the inductive method in biblical studies. Rather than imposing preconceived theories on the sources, it was a return to the sources themselves to discover what they revealed of their origins. Astruc confined his studies to Genesis, his conclusion being that the strange alternation of names for deity, Yahweh and Elohim, indicated diverse authorship of the original materials. Moses had used sources in writing Genesis, he concluded. The importance of these textual varia-

---

[1] Where Moses' name is used in the third person: Ex. 24: 4; Number 33: 2; Dt. 31: 9, 12.

[2] Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein (Karlstadt d.1541), De Canonicis Scriptoris, p. 85.

[3] Benedictus de Spinoza (1632-1667) Tractatus Theologies-Politicus, pp. 104-124. The chief works of Benedictus de Spinoza trans. from Latin with an introduction R. H. M. Elwes (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1908).

[4] Richard Simon, Historia Critica veteris Testamenti (Paris, 1681-85).

[5] Jean Astruc, Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genese. Avec des remarques, qui appuient on qui e'claircissent ces conjectures (Bruxelles: Fricx, 1753).

tions, the long subsequent development has shown. From this humble beginning the vast structure of criticism has been built by the labors of many minds. The course had been charted. If the texts themselves held the secrets of their own origin and growth, they might be freely investigated to discover what the nature of such literary evolution was.

Textual studies continued apace. The significant contributions that followed will be briefly enumerated. Eichhorn[1] discovered linguistic differences in the sources as well as differences in the divine names. The investigation was rapidly pushed through the Pentateuch and beyond. The brilliant young De Wette, in a Master's degree dissertation,[2] showed that Deuteronomy was the book found in the temple in Josiah's reign and the basis of his reforms. This dating of Deuteronomy has since been looked upon as the "keystone of the arch" of Pentateuchal criticism, the one fixed point to which other dates are chronologically related.

The practice of treating Joshua with the Pentateuch was begun by Bleek[3] and Geddes,[4] his contemporary, who discovered the close connection between the Pentateuch and that book. F. Tuch[5] pushed their investigations farther when he proved that the Elohistic source is also used in Joshua. Ewald[6] established the fact that the criterion of divine names is less dependable after

---

[1]Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, Einleitung ins Alte Testament (Leipzig: Bey Weidmanns erben und Reich, 1787).

[2]Wilhelm De Wette, Dissertatio Critica (1805). Cf. ibid., a critical and historical introduction to the canonical scriptures, trans. and enl. Theodore Parker (Boston: C. C. Little & J. Brown, 1822).

[3]Friedrich Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1878).

[4]Alexander Geddes, Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, Vol. I containing remarks on the Pentateuch (London: Davis, Wilkes and Taylor, 1800).

[5]Friedrich Tuch, Kommentar über die Genesis (Halle: Buchhandlung des Weisenhauses, 1838).

[6]Herman Ewald, The Antiquities of Israel, trans. Henry S. Solly (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1876), and other works by author.

Ex. 2, but on the basis of linguistic characteristics, he concluded that the two main sources already known continue after this point.

Important discoveries were made by Hupfeld and Graf. Hupfeld[1] working about the middle of last century distinguished a second Elohistic source in Genesis. Graf[2] whose name was to be combined with that of Wellhausen in designating the traditional hypothesis, concluded from his investigations of the legal sections that the legislation in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers was later than Deuteronomy.

These may be regarded as the epoch making discoveries between Astruc and Wellhausen. The formulation of a theory from these data passed through a similar evolutionary process. The variations in the course of this evolution concerned mainly the date of production and the interrelationship of the sources. The progress by which the orthodox-critical theory was reached is usually divided into four stages: Fragment, Supplement, Documentary, and Graf-Wellhausen.

At the outset, the Fragment Theory held sway. Scholars thought the evidence pointed to a large number of fragments composing the books of the Pentateuch. This hypothesis contained a large element of truth but failing to do justice to the unity of the Pentateuch, it was gradually displaced by the Supplement Theory. The latter theory gave more recognition to the common purpose running through the Mosaic books. Advocates of the Supplement Theory believed that the Elohistic stratum of the Pentateuch was the oldest source and formed the groundwork of the whole. This Elohistic section had been revised and annotated by the Jahwist editor who added many independent sections. Deuteronomy, it was thought, was the latest addition.

When a second Elohistic source was discovered, a revision of the Supplement Theory became necessary. Thereupon, the Document Theory, recognizing four main sources, gradually displaced the Supplement Theory. This was essentially the Graf-Wellhausen

---

[1]Herman C. K. F. Hupfeld, Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853).

[2]Karl Heinrich Graf, Die geschichtlichen bücher des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866), pp. 112-113.

Theory with the exception of a difference in dating. The earlier critics thought the Elohistic strand was the oldest.[1]

The analysis into the four main sources substantially completed, the last important modification was the dating of P after Deuteronomy. This was largely the work of Graf,[2] Kuenen[3] and Reuss.[4] Studied in relation to the Eighth and Seventh Century prophets, the so-called Mosaic Code was found to be unknown to those prophets. On this and other grounds it was placed last of the four codes.

This development was, of course, far more complicated than this brief statement would indicate. The stages were not clearly marked off from each other but overlapped, the theories being held in combination or with certain qualifications until Wellhausen's studies. Wellhausen clarified the orthodox-critical theory in his great Prolegomena in which he applied it to the history of Israel's traditions and institutions. This work brought wide acceptation of the hypothesis throughout the scholarly world.

Since Wellhausen's time the divergences from the accepted theory have been in the main ineffective.[5] Dillmann[6] argued that

---

[1]There was considerable justification for this view as it is now known that both the E and P strata contain much ancient material.

[2]Graf, op. cit.

[3]Abraham Kuenen, An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. Trans. from Dutch by Philip H. Wickstead, M. A. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886).

[4]Eduard Wilhelm Eugen Reuss, Die geschichte der heiligen schriften alten Testaments (Brannschweig: C. A. Schwetschke and Sohn, 1881).

[5]Erdmaus merits some consideration although his views have won slight favor. He held the fantastic view that the Kernel of the Pentateuch is an Adam book, beginning at Genesis 5: 1, or a Jacob recension of the same which was originally polytheistic and arose before 700 B. C. Meanwhile, an Israel recension of this, also polytheistic, appeared before Deuteronomy. When the latter was discovered, it was interwoven with the Jacob recension and the combined work revised from the Deuteronomic standpoint, further additions being made later. Cf. Erdmaus, Alt Test. Studien: i, Genesis (1908); ii, Die Vorges Israel (1908); iii, Exodus (1910).

[6]August Dillmann, Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded (Trans. from last edition by Wm. B. Stevenson [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897]), Exodus und Leviticus (Leipzig: Verlay von S. Hirzel, 1880).

P was earlier than D. Dahse[1] and Wiener[2] attempted to show that the text was too uncertain to warrant the reliance the dominant theory places on the divine names as a criterion of analysis. Their arguments were based on comparative studies of the Hebrew and Septuagint texts. By establishing the superior trustworthiness of the Hebrew over the Greek text, Skinner[3] has disposed of their arguments to the satisfaction of most scholars.

In more recent years much controversy has surrounded the date and origin of Deuteronomy.[4] Welch[5] argued for the early character of much of the Deuteronomic material. Koenig,[6] Kennett[7] and others sought to place it much later than the widely accepted date. None of these views has gained favor among critics, however.

Moeller[8] has recently argued for the unity of the Pentateuch. This view which naturally tends to favor Mosaic authorship has received slight attention from scholars. The most recent and perhaps the most promising development has come from Volz[1] and Rudolf[1] who have sought to show that E was not an independent

---

[1] Johannes Dahse, Textkritische materialien zur Hexateuchfrage.

[2] Harold Marcus Wiener, Essays in Pentateuch Criticism (London: E. Stock, 1910). Origin of the Pentateuch (London: E. Stock, 1912).

[3] John Skinner, Divine Names in Genesis (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914).

[4] The Deuteronomic problem is summarized in the article, "The Problem of Deuteronomy: A Symposium," J. B. L. XLVII (1928), 305-379. Cf. Graham, "Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy," J. R. VII (1927), 396-418. Cf. also, Arthur Robert Siebens' L'origine due Code Deuteronomique (Paris: E. Leroux, 1929), for bibliography.

[5] Adam C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, a new theory of its origin (London: J. Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1924).

[6] Eduard Koenig, Das Deutemomium (Kommentar zum alten Testament, by Ernst Sellin).

[7] Robert Hatch Kennett, Deuteronomy and the Decalogue (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1920).

[8] Wilhelm Moeller, Die Einheit und Echtheit der 5 bücher Mosis (Bad Salzaflen: Bibelbund, 1931).

[9] Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph, Der Elohist als Erzähler ein irrweg der Pentateuch Kritik (Giessen: A. Topelmann, 1933).

historian but rather an editor who expanded the earlier Jahwistic history.

This briefly is the status of Pentateuchal criticism at the present time.

The orthodoxy of the Wellhausen theory has been dominant in the field of Old Testament study so long that a new attempt to modify it in any of its essential features must be viewed as hazardous. But lack of complete unanimity among scholars gives one some encouragement to re-open the question.

It may be said that the critical attack has done an important service in making it clear that the historical corpus emerged gradually from an evolving social process and that no major section of it could have been the product of one age, let alone one man. When this fact is recognized, one can understand why analysis is so difficult and why opinions differ as to the sections to be included in a given source. For the most part, the analysis will undoubtedly stand for all time to come. The analysis of the Deuteronomic and Priestly sources particularly, the characteristics of which are quite easily discernible, have seldom been called in question. But this is not so true of J and E, which are almost inextricably interwoven in some places. Their separation at these points is considered highly dubious and some scholars would prefer to treat them as one source JE.

The lack of unanimity on some points becomes very significant in the light of recent trends in Old Testament study. One of the most important of these trends may be said to be the increasing tendency to recognize the great antiquity of many of the practices and customs reflected in the documents coupled with the presence of very ancient materials in our sources. The close relation of Hebrew and neighboring civilizations and the interchange of ideas and practices is also well known. These facts must be borne in mind in constructing a theory of the evolution of the literature.

Lack of agreement centers chiefly on the unity or lack of unity within the sources, their extent, their dating, and the method of their compilation. The importance for the present investigation of these divergences from the orthodox-critical hypothesis will be seen as we proceed.

Taking up first the differences that exist among scholars in their treatment of J, the problem of the unity of this source

will be considered. While all are agreed that J has used numerous sources, there is disagreement as to whether the J of the Hexateuch is from one hand or several writers. J's unity has received advocacy by Sellin, who says, "When all is said and done, there is a quite clearly marked religious and literary, one might almost say artistic, individuality which shows itself in the whole writing; and the work keeps before it a definite purpose, even though it has sometimes difficulty in mastering the diverse materials which it worked up and joined together."[1] Many critics, however, find secondary elements in J, particularly in the earlier portions, Gen. 2-11. The tendency among critics is to recognize in J in its present form the literary work of a "school." However, one may say that the belief predominates that some one spirit has dominated that school.

Unanimity is lacking among scholars as to J's extent. Many scholars regard Jg. 2: 5 as the lower limit of J, the original narrative being confined to the Texateuch. On the other hand, some scholars have noted the close affinity of the ancient material in Judges, Samuel and Kings with earlier J, and attributed it to that source.[2] It is accurate to say that the dogma of the "Hexateuch" has been a determining factor in the treatment of J and, as we shall see, of E and the whole problem of the corpus.

There has been greater unanimity, however, concerning the date of J. The great majority of scholars are agreed that J is older than E. Likewise, the majority would date J about 850 B.C. A notable exception to this is found in Sellin, however, who thinks J originated much earlier, probably during the reign of Solomon.[3]

In general we find greater disagreement when we come to E. The majority reject E's unity and distinguish E_1 and E_2

---

[1]Sellin, op cit., p. 58. Cf. Otto Proksch, Hexateuch (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906).

[2]George Foote Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1910), pp. xxxiiif. Cf. Cornill, op. cit., pp. 177f.

[3]Sellin, op. cit., p. 56. The absence of any hint in J of the division of the Kingdom is the determining factor in Sellin's early dating.

strata.[1] The view that E is a composition produced by a single literary personality has, however, received some support.[2]

On the question of E's extent we find a situation prevailing similar to that which exists with respect to J. Most critics confine their original E to the Hexateuch. But a number of scholars trace E through the later books of the corpus, Judges, Samuel and Kings, as in the case of J.[3]

Sharp differences of opinion surround the relative dating of E and J. While the majority assign the priority to J, some place E earlier than J, dating it as early as 900-850 B.C.[4] Significantly enough, these differences of viewpoint on the dating have been grounded in differences of viewpoint on the analysis. The question of date is closely tied up with the other phases of the problem, extent, analysis and unity. The fact that a number of scholars distinguish secondary E (E_2) in the Elohistic strand has been noted. Obviously, these scholars will place E earlier than if they were to determine E's social milieu on the basis of a unified E, including in the original document the late theocratic material which they regard as secondary.

One other difference of opinion remains to be mentioned, that of the place of E's origin. Smend[5] disagrees with the majority opinion which places E in the Northern Kingdom and ascribes to it Southern origin.

Only the more important divergences from the generally accepted solution of the problem have been mentioned at this point. Differences of opinion exist also on details of analysis. It is clear, therefore, that when we speak of agreement among scholars on the orthodox-critical hypothesis we must do so with reservations. The lack of agreement is such that the problem can by no means be

---

[1] Kuenen, op. cit., pp. 61f, and most critics since his time.

[2] Rudolf Smend, Die Erzahlung des Hexateuchs auf ihre Quellen Untersucht (Berlin: G. Reiner, 1912), pp. 342-352.

[3] The same scholars, Cornill, Moore, Budde, et al.

[4] The tendency in early criticism was to place E very early. Cf. Eberhard Schrader, Studien zur Kritik und Erklarung der biblischen urgeschichte, Genesis cap I-XI (Zurich: Meyer & Toller, 1863). Die Keilenschriften und das alte Testament (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1872).

[5] Smend, op. cit., pp. 342-352.

considered closed. The leads suggested by some of these divergences would seem to warrant a new attack on the whole problem. This is particularly true in the light of the recent trends to which we have referred. When the literature is viewed as the deposit of a stream of life going back much farther than originally supposed, preserving customs and ideas of very great antiquity, the problem of analysis and dating is very different from what it was before this long past was known. The tendency in Wellhausen's time was to disregard the evolution through which a document passed before it reached the form in which we now have it.

The changes that have come about in Old Testament study have come about through a perfecting of methodology. This change in methodology has been favored by the increase in knowledge along all lines pertaining to Old Testament problems. When the orthodox-critical theory was first formulated, extra-biblical materials were almost entirely wanting to supplement the evidences provided by the biblical sources themselves. Now all this has been changed. A vast amount of data touching on Hebrew life at every point has been placed at the disposal of the student of the Old Testament. Naturally, the methodology employed in the early period of criticism would be considered inadequate for our time. This increase of our knowledge through Archaeology and its bearing on our problem as a justification for reconsideration of the whole question will next be considered.

To appreciate the importance of Archaeology for Old Testament study, one has only to observe the vast literature[1] that has

---

[1]Some of the more important general works on Archaeology and its bearing on the Old Testament are as follows:

Archibald Henry Sayce, The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments (London: Society for promoting Christian knowledge, 1895).

Ira Maurice Price, The Monuments and the Old Testament (Christian Culture Press, 1899).

Theophilus G. Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia. (London: Society for promoting Christian knowledge, 1902).

Albert T. Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel (Philadelphia: S. S. Times Pub. Co., 1907).

Alfred Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East Vols. I, II (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911).

George A. Barton, Archaeology and the Bible (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1925).

Wm. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (New York, Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1932).

For a brief sketch of the history of Palestinian Archae-

grown up in recent years in this field and to recognize that practically all the findings therein set forth, covering as they do the entire Near East, bear directly or indirectly on the Old Testament. Hardly a book, monograph, or article on an Old Testament problem appears now in which the author does not at some point avail himself of data provided by the Archaeologist. Despite this great contribution, we are told that Archaeology is still in its infancy. We have reason, therefore, to believe that our knowledge of the past will receive continuous expansion and enrichment from this source. One is justified in believing, also, that much more light is to be shed on the pages of the Old Testament from this source. Since Archaeology has established the fact that the Hebrews were not a unique people in their culture but rather shared a civilization belonging to numerous peoples, it follows that the student of the Old Testament must recognize that his is not a unique pursuit but rather a cooperative enterprise shared with all those who endeavor to reconstruct the past of these Near Eastern peoples.

A few of the more general Archaeological results as they pertain to the entire Near East may be mentioned. The historical period has been pushed back into the past thousand of years. Periods which were formerly classed as pre-history, now can be reconstructed with a fair degree of completeness. Whole civilzations entirely unheard of before have been unearthed, as, for example, the Sumerian and Hittite. The latter name, of course, was encountered in the Old Testament but it was little more than a legendary allusion for the critic. The history and culture of the peoples of Syria-Palestine, Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia and groups less well-known have been discovered and recorded. Our knowledge of their political institutions, religions, economic life, the movements of their armies and the forces that impelled them to extend their borders has been made fairly complete.

Some of the points at which our expanding information, of the past of the entire Near East in general and Palestine in particular, impinge on the Old Testament may be cited.[1] It has

---

ology. Cf. William C. Graham and Herbert G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), pp. 314f.

[1] T. J. Meek, "Some O. T. Problems in the Light of Recent Archaeological Discoveries," Can. J. of Rel. Thought VI (1929), 374-381.

been shown that man's residence in Palestine is of much longer duration than formerly supposed. Palestinian culture had its beginning at least as early as the Paleolithic age. We now know that the origins of the Hebrews are very ancient and complex. The name Hebrew (Habiru) has been shown to be an appellative rather than an ethnic term and to have originally meant Nomad or the like.

Hebrew culture owes much to that of surrounding peoples. The excavations of most sites show Egyptian influence in Palestine. We know too that much Babylonian influence has been exerted on Hebrew life. The flood and creation stories have their parallels in Babylonian literature. Canaanite and Hebrew law has much in common with the Code of Hammurabi, as well as the codes of Assyria and the Hittites.

Excavations of Palestinian sites show that there was no complete break in Canaanite culture such as would be occasioned by a sudden triumphant entry into Canaan of the united Hebrew tribes: The evidence favors the view that the Hebrews only very gradually occupied the more desirable areas of Canaan. As they did so, they slowly appropriated for themselves the culture of the Canaanites.

Most significant is the conclusion that the religion of the Hebrews for centuries after their entry into Palestine was similar to that of their neighbors, a religion of productivity. We are able to construct a fairly complete picture of this religious culture from extra-biblical sources. This was entirely unavailable to earlier critics.

This brief sketch of the extent to which our knowledge of the Hebrews and their neighbors has increased has been offered here as a justification for re-opening a problem that received its solution before this widening of our horizon took place. The early critics had little more than the texts of the Bible to work on. They did not have, for example, the invaluable aid given the present day scholar by the supplementation of the Bible with such materials as the Tel-El-Amarna letters and the Ras Shamra Tablets. The accuracy and meaning of biblical statements could only be checked by reference to other biblical statements and the general picture obtained from the Bible itself.

The task of the early critic was a difficult one indeed. We do not say that a fresh approach to an old problem on the basis of our vastly expanded knowledge with admittedly greater advantages

in favor of the present day scholar, is any guarantee of fundamental changes in the old solution. But we do say the times favor, even demand the renewal of the investigation.

CHAPTER I

CRITICISM OF THE WELLHAUSEN POSITION

A striking feature of the Wellhausen position is the fact that it is based on the "Hexateuch." Criticism had gone a long way toward the solution of the problem of the evolution of this literature even on the basis of the Pentateuch, however. But when it was discovered that the sources of Joshua had affinities with the Pentateuchal sources, as previously mentioned, critics began the practice of including Joshua with the Pentateuch. The dogma of the "Hexateuch" quickly won acceptance and by the time of Wellhausen was well established.

The standard works on Pentateuchal, or rather Hexateuchal, criticism which have dominated the field for more than half a century, are limited in their approach to the problem to the first six books of the Old Testament exclusively. So far as can be determined, critics have been unanimous in accepting the Hexateuchal convention.[1]

When we come to the later books of what we have chosen to call the historical corpus, that is, the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, critics have been equally unanimous in recognizing the close affinities of the ancient materials in these books with the J and E strata of the Hexateuch. Some critics have gone so far as to conclude that the J and E of the Hexateuch extend on into these books. And yet these same critics have held their Hexateuchal position practically unchanged from its original form and have proceeded to work out a theory of J and E in the remaining books on this basis.

The theory to which most critics resort to account for the

---

[1] Julius Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen bücher des Alten Testaments (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1899).
J. Estlin Carpenter and George Harford Battersby, The Composition of the Hexateuch (London: Longmans Greene & Co., 1902).
Cornill, op. cit., pp. 76-91.
Sellin, op. cit., pp. 100-120.
Kuenen, op. cit., pp. 138-173.

assumedly "later" J E was, as we have seen, that of expansion by "schools" of later writers.[1] If the Hexateuch is a unit and the original J and E ended at the close of Joshua, or at the latest Jg. 2: 5, as most scholars have held, then, obviously, the J and E materials in the succeeding books were secondary. The close affinities with what they considered the original J and E were to be accounted for by the fact that the later writers were imbued with the same idealism and aims as the earlier writers.

But if we follow the clue of criticism in its unanimous view that this ancient material of the later books has a decided likeness to the J and E of the Hexateuch and conclude with some scholars that J and E do extend throughout the historical corpus, then the problem looms up in a very different light. In that case, criticism has been unfair to the post-Hexateuchal J and E, making of them, purely on assumption, but appendages of the older sources. The Wellhausen theory, then, can be considered no more than a partial solution even of the J E of the so-called Hexateuch inasmuch as some of the most valuable data have been excluded from consideration.

Added to the data provided in the J and E of the Hexateuch, we have the wealth of material found in Judges, Samuel and Kings, from which to formulate our hypothesis of the evolution of the corpus. The stories of the Judges are admitted to be among the most authentic and valuable for the period of the early residence of the Hebrew tribes in Palestine. The oldest section in Samuel[2] is held by many to be by a contemporary of David whose career he so realistically sets forth. The theocratic[3] strand in I Samuel

---

[1] Cf. Karl F. Budde, Die Bucher Richter und Samuel ihre guellen und ihr aufbau (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890), pp. 155-166, 264-276. Scholars have noticed the affinities of the Hexateuchal and post-Hexateuchal J and E but some are reluctant to admit the continuation of the same strands through the historical corpus and, of course, common authorship of the entire strand.
Cf. Eduard Koenig, "Judges," H. B. D. II, 811-813.

[2] II Samuel 9-20.

[3] The stratum has been designated "the history of the theocratic succession." Driver, op. cit., p. 116. In keeping with this view of the most dominant characteristic of the so-called E, the author may be designated as the "theocrat" or the "theocratic writer." The reasons for this designation of the later source and its author will, it is hoped, become clear in the development of the study.

which expands the older narrative, describing the events of the founding of the Monarchy, furnishes some of our most valuable evidences for ascertaining the characteristics of the theocratic contribution as a whole, the aims of its writer and the social situation in which he worked. It is our contention that the exclusion from consideration of these excellent materials in the solution of the problem as a whole is the first great defect of the Wellhausen position.

Let us consider the evidences that favor the view that we are here dealing with a historical corpus. When the literature, Genesis to Kings, is examined, the first phenomenon that meets the eye is the division into "books." From the standpoint of origins, the question at once arises whether these "books" had independent origin and were later assembled in their present form or are parts of an organic whole and the divisions artificial.

A cursory examination of the "books" shows that they represent phases of the history. Genesis comprises the creation stories, mythological tales and the patriarchal history down to the sojourn in Egypt. Exodus and Numbers portray the desert wanderings immediately following. Joshua contains the account of the conquest of Canaan, and Judges that of the period of tribal independence and slow consolidation in Canaan. The "books" of I and II Samuel describe the events in connection with the establishment of the Monarchy and carry its history to the end of David's reign. Kings continue the history of the Monarchy through both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms until the fall of Jerusalem.

Even though no major phase of the entire historical narrative is neglected in the literature, it is possible that gaps between the phases may exist at the points of transition. To determine whether this is true or not an examination of the transitions is necessary. When the transition between Genesis and Exodus is examined certain facts are apparent. At the close of Genesis, the Israelites are still in Egypt. Joseph's death is recorded.[1] But Exodus immediately resumes the Egyptian experience. Ex. 1: 1-5 gives a list of Jacob's sons who had gone to Egypt and statistics on the number of people in the group. The narrative begins forthwith with the account of the oppression and the deliverance by Moses, which events occupy the attention of the

---

[1]Gen. 50: 26.

author of the narrative portions of Exodus. There cannot, therefore, be said to be a break in theme development between the "books" of Genesis and Exodus.

The last part of Exodus (Chapters 25-40, with the exception of Chapters 32, 33, 34) is legalistic. This legalistic section continues without a break through Leviticus to Num. 10: 28 and is not a part of the original history. In the last portions of the narrative in Exodus, Chapters 32, 33, 34, we find Moses and the Israelites at Sinai where the tables of the law are given. When the narrative section of Numbers, Chapters 10: 29 to 24: 25 is examined, it is apparent that it goes directly back to the story in Exodus. At Num. 10: 29 the journey from Sinai is begun which carried the Israelites on the trek around the Dead Sea, through Edomite and Moabite territory, up to the Jordan. Here again no break is apparent between the narrative portions of Exodus and Numbers. Numbers concludes with the legalistic section, Chapters 25-36.

Deuteronomy is cast as a series of addresses by Moses in the plains of Moab, the last events before the entry into Canaan. The author of Deuteronomy has taken care that his "book" should not destroy the continuity of the narrative, fitting it perfectly into the historical scheme as he found it. The last Chapter of Deuteronomy[1] records the death and burial of Moses.

The "book" of Joshua opens with these words: "Now after the death of Moses, etc.," referring back to Deuteronomy 34. Joshua continues the previous story without intermission recounting the next phase of the history, the rapid conquest and allotment of the land under the direction of Joshua. Joshua brings his work to a close with a farewell address.[2]

The narrative moves rapidly to the account of the Judges, the story of the conquest merging imperceptibly into that of the succeeding period. The "book" of Judges opens with the reference to Joshua's death[3] referring to Josh. 24: 29 where that event is recorded. There are literary problems in connection with Judges 1 which cannot be taken up here. Suffice it to say that Judges 1

---

[1] Chapter 34.

[2] Joshua 24.

[3] Jg. 1: 1

presents a different picture of the conquest from that found in Joshua. A number of verses found in Judges 1 duplicate passages embedded in Joshua, which give an earlier and what is generally considered to be a more reliable picture of the events of the conquest than that found in the major part of Joshua. Judges 2: 6, the beginning of the "Deuteronomic book"[1] of Judges, refers back to Joshua's farewell address.[2] The intervening portion may be a harmonistic editorial section[3] inserted to explain that the conquest was incomplete and why such events as those recorded in Judges could transpire. Whatever editorial work has taken place, there is ample proof at this point that even the editors intended to leave the impression of an organic connection between that phase of the history covered in Joshua and the succeeding one in Judges.[4]

At the end of the "book" of Judges we are faced with another literary problem in the matter of Chapters 17-21. This section is evidently early, various conjectures being offered as to how it reached its present position.[5] I Samuel opens with the account of the birth of Samuel and the establishment of the Monarchy. While the literary connection between Judges and I Samuel is not as conspicuous as elsewhere, there is no serious

---

[1]Jg. 2: 6-16: 31 constitutes the "Deuteronomic book" of Judges. A Deuteronomic editor has set the "JE book" of Judges in a Deuteronomic framework embodying his philosophy of history.

[2]Joshua 24.

[3]The section Jg. 1: 1-2: 5 is J material and may have been injected here by the Deuteronomic editor himself to harmonize his philosophy of history with the point of view found in Joshua. If the conquest had been so complete, there would have been no basis for the successive apostasy, repentance, victory sequence of the "Deuteronomic book" of Judges.

[4]Jg. 2: 6 apparently connects with Josh. 24: 28 while Jg. 1: 1 connects with Josh. 24: 29. Both show that even in different stages of the transmission of the narrative, there was a sense of the continuity thereof.

[5]The material of Judges 17-21 generally regarded as being older than the preceeding section, may have been a part of the "J book" or "JE book" of Judges. If so, the Deuteronomic editor not finding it suitable, omitted it from his "book." Fearing the loss of this material may have prompted some later editor to insert it in its present position.

presents a different picture of the conquest from that found in Joshua. A number of verses found in Judges 1 duplicate passages embedded in Joshua, which give an earlier and what is generally considered to be a more reliable picture of the events of the conquest than that found in the major part of Joshua. Judges 2: 6, the beginning of the "Deuteronomic book"[1] of Judges, refers back to Joshua's farewell address.[2] The intervening portion may be a harmonistic editorial section[3] inserted to explain that the conquest was incomplete and why such events as those recorded in Judges could transpire. Whatever editorial work has taken place, there is ample proof at this point that even the editors intended to leave the impression of an organic connection between that phase of the history covered in Joshua and the succeeding one in Judges.[4]

At the end of the "book" of Judges we are faced with another literary problem in the matter of Chapters 17-21. This section is evidently early, various conjectures being offered as to how it reached its present position.[5] I Samuel opens with the account of the birth of Samuel and the establishment of the Monarchy. While the literary connection between Judges and I Samuel is not as conspicuous as elsewhere, there is no serious

---

[1]Jg. 2: 6-16: 31 constitutes the "Deuteronomic book" of Judges. A Deuteronomic editor has set the "JE book" of Judges in a Deuteronomic framework embodying his philosophy of history.

[2]Joshua 24.

[3]The section Jg. 1: 1-2: 5 is J material and may have been injected here by the Deuteronomic editor himself to harmonize his philosophy of history with the point of view found in Joshua. If the conquest had been so complete, there would have been no basis for the successive apostasy, repentance, victory sequence of the "Deuteronomic book" of Judges.

[4]Jg. 2: 6 apparently connects with Josh. 24: 28 while Jg. 1: 1 connects with Josh. 24: 29. Both show that even in different stages of the transmission of the narrative, there was a sense of the continuity thereof.

[5]The material of Judges 17-21 generally regarded as being older than the preceeding section, may have been a part of the "J book" or "JE book" of Judges. If so, the Deuteronomic editor not finding it suitable, omitted it from his "book." Fearing the loss of this material may have prompted some later editor to insert it in its present position.

gap in time between the "books." The same historical situation obtains in the Samson story as we find in the days of Samuel and the establishment of the Monarchy, namely, the Philistine crisis.

In the Hebrew Canon, the books of Samuel and Kings formed each a single "book." Regarding them as a complete history of the two Kingdoms, the Septuagint translators brought all four together and regarded them as the "Books of the Kingdom." This view that Samuel and Kings are organically connected was fully justified, not only by the common theme of the books but also by the close union of II Samuel and I Kings. The old source, II Samuel 9-20 continues into Kings, ending either at I Ki. 2: 11 where the death of David is recorded, or at II Ki. 2: 46 where Solomon has been inducted into the Kingship and all the members of the Adonijah faction have been put to death.[1] The division between II Samuel and I Kings is clearly an artificial one and evidently was made at the wrong place, being originally intended to come at the end of the history of David.

The narrative moves swiftly from beginning to end, treating one general subject, namely the story of the Hebrew people from the earliest beginnings down to the times of the writers. From the age of the Patriarchs to the end of the Monarchy, the events of Hebrew history pass quickly across the scene. No one of the phases could be omitted without destroying the continuity of the story. Each phase is closely articulated with the one which precedes and follows it. From the standpoint of the subject matter involved, the literature Genesis to Kings may be said, therefore, to exhibit the general characteristics of a corpus.

Viewing the question of the historical corpus from the standpoint of J and E, if it can be established that these strata continue beyond Joshua, possibly even throughout the literature, the position tentatively adopted above will receive further confirmation. Reference has been made to the critical position on this point. As eminent a scholar as George Foote Moore has this to say:

> Early in the Ninth Century, the traditions of the invasion and settlement of Western Palestine, of the subsequent conflicts in various parts of the land with the native popula-

---

[1] The oldest source probably ends at II Ki. 2: 46 because the writer would have an interest in showing that Solomon was the true successor of David by the latter's choice.

> tion or with the new invaders, and of the heroic deeds of Israel's leaders and champions in these struggles were collected and fixed in writing, probably as part of a historical work which included the patriarchal age, the migration from Egypt and the history of Israel, under the Kingdom down to the author's (J's) own time.
>
> Perhaps a century later, another book of similar character and scope was written, containing in part the same stories, but in a form adhering less closely to historical reality (E). A second recension of this work (E_2) bears very distinctly the impress of the prophetic movement of the Eighth Century, and specifically of Hosea's teaching and may be assigned to the end of the Eighth or the beginning of the Seventh Century.[1]

Other scholars are equally emphatic on this point.[2]

One would conclude by a priori reasoning that J and E continue beyond the limits of the so-called Hexateuch, otherwise one is forced to the position that their authors ended their narratives at a point where the Hebrews had merely gained admission to Palestine. This would mean that the great achievement of nationhood by the Hebrews was not considered of sufficient importance to be included in a history of Israel. It is unthinkable that J would have concluded his narrative without telling the story of the glorious age of David and Solomon. Moreover, to suppose that the Judean historian failed to make use of the contemporary source about David (II Samuel 9-20), which was extant in J's time and to which he surely must have had access, taxes one's credulity overmuch. There is no valid reason for supposing that the J and E writers did not cover the history down approximately to their own time.

Without, at this point, attempting, minute examination of the sources, to show that the post-Hexateuchal J and E are similar

---

[1] Moore, op. cit., p. xxxiii.

[2] Cf. Delitzsch on the source of the Historical Corpus: "There was a time when the horizon of Pentateuchal criticism was bounded by Genesis and beginning of Exodus. We now know that the mode of composition found in Genesis continues to the 34th Chapter of Deuteronomy. It extends moreover beyond Deuteronomy 34 and continues in the Book of Joshua. . . . And this Hexateuch also is only a component part of the great historical work in five parts, viz. Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, extending from Genesis 1 to II Kings 25 of which the Pentateuch forms one part." (Delitzsch, New Comm. on Genesis, i, 45, 47. Quoted from article "Genesis," H. E. Ryle H. B. D., ii, 143).

in character to the J and E of the Hexateuch, we may safely proceed on the hypothesis that they are from the same strata. If this is true, it offers additional evidence that we have here a body of literature, in reality, a historical corpus of organically and genetically related parts.

Having adopted this hypothesis, it is our contention that there is no real basis for the vertical divisions as they now appear in our Bibles. To be sure, this literature has had a slow evolution. It has grown by accretions. But these accretions have been of the nature of horizontal stratifications throughout all or most of the narrative. Thus has the growth of the literature proceeded and not by the appearance, from time to time, of books treating chronologically new phases of the theme.

It will be observed that the characteristic of horizontal expansion has been ascribed by the Wellhausen school to the Hexateuch, but has been denied to the historical corpus as a whole.[1] Putting it concretely, the Wellhausen position is this: After the completion of the JE source of the Hexateuch, it underwent both lengthening and thickening processes. The lengthening took place through the work of "schools" which extended the scope of J and E; the thickening by additions and expansions of the Hexateuchal JE by Deuteronomic and Priestly editors. The latter editors worked through all or most of the entire narrative of Genesis to Kings the Wellhausen partisans would admit.[2] But this would seem to be an arbitrary reconstruction so far as it pertains to the J and E of the later books of the Historical corpus and is not supported by adequate evidence.[3]

A partial explanation for the phenomenaon of vertical division which has taken place in the historical corpus may be found in the nature of the scrolls on which such ancient records were kept. The original Judean History probably occupied the space of one such scroll, about the size of one of the larger "books" of the Old Testament. But when the narrative had received constant

---

[1] Except in the case of the Deuteronomic expansion.

[2] The priestly expansion is limited to the so-called Hexateuch.

[3] A qualification of this statement should be made in the case of J. The original Judean History probably ended at I Ki. 2: 46. The later history of the Monarchy does constitute an extension of the scope of the original narrative.

expansion and addition in the course of time it got far beyond the limits of one "book." Vertical divisions became a necessity and it was but natural that such divisions should occur at points setting off phases of the general theme.

When such divisions were made cannot be determined with certainty. Certain facts of the history of the literature are definitely known, however. The development of the conception of Moses' function as a lawgiver was responsible for the gravitation of the legal codes to the early part of the narrative, thus constituting a great expansion of the original story dealing with Moses. Following the exile, the Torah achieved a high degree of sacredness and importance in the Jewish Church. This reverence in which the law was held accounts for the fact that this was the first portion of Scripture to achieve Canonical status. We know that by this time the vertical division had been made at the end of Deuteronomy setting off the Mosaic law. It is more than likely, however, that this and other vertical divisions had been accomplished a considerable time before this. Probably not long after the priestly additions were made in the Fifth Century the Torah began to enjoy separate circulation. The Deuteronomic Code, while written in a form to fit the narrative as a whole doubtlessly circulated apart from the main narrative. It is reasonable to believe that with the appearance of Deuteronomy we have the beginning of the "book" idea. It was a "book of the law" that was "found" in the temple. We know also that the conception of a sacred literature began at this time. It might well be, however, that even at the time of the completion of the JE narrative, the document had grown so large that it became necessary to mark off by vertical divisions[1] such phases of the general theme as those of the conquest, Judges, and the phases represented in the books of Samuel and Kings. Reference has been made to the fact that divisions were made in the books of Samuel and Kings by the Septuagint translators.

It is clear, therefore, that there may be justification for the use of the term Pentateuch, but for the term Hexateuch, none whatsoever. But even the usefulness of the former term is

---

[1] By vertical division is meant, of course, a crosswise severing of the narrative as one would cut a rope.

confined to the later history of the evolution of the literature in connection with the growth in esteem of the Mosaic Code and its canonization. So far as the critical problem of the narrative of the historical corpus is concerned, the term Pentateuch is as meaningless as the term Hexateuch.

If we have succeeded in establishing the fact that in this literature we are dealing with a corpus and not a collection of "books," it is obvious that our approach to the problem of J and E is conditioned by that view of the literature. In all fairness it may be said that a solution of the problem that has been worked out on the basis of but a part of the literature cannot stand unchallenged.

With regard to the general character of the two strands J and E certain facts are apparent. They largely parallel each other, although the scope of E is somewhat more restricted than that of J. The latter includes the primeval stories of Genesis 2-11, whereas E begins with the call of Abraham, Genesis 15. J's narrative includes the creation story (Gen. 2: 46f) and has been described as possessing the character of universal history. Practically all the events touched upon in J, receive treatment in some form in E. Some sections of E, however, appear to be free from J material and are units in themselves, but in other places the two sources are almost inextricably interwoven. In view of these facts, critics are practically unanimous in holding the opinion that E had access to J and wrote his narrative with J before him. E wrote, so they say, not to produce a polemic against J, but to provide a history that Ephraimaites would find to their liking. The earlier narrative J represents the Judean point of view and reflects the more naieve religious outlook of the earlier period. With the passing of time, J's history was no longer satisfactory, so critics have argued. This inadequacy lay both in its religious naïveté and in its Judean bias. The need for a new history written from the Northern view point and suitable for a more religiously sophisticated age was supplied in the E narrative.

Let us examine the evidences on which critics have based their conclusions. They have been quite correct in their opinion that diverse religious viewpoints are reflected in the two sources. But the place of religion in culture and the relation of the documents to Hebrew culture in general have not been adequately treated in the orthodox reconstruction. Consequently, the

significance of the different religious viewpoints has been largely lost.

The critical view of the geographical positions of the two narratives and the corresponding sectional bias of each rests on such evidences as the preference of each writer for heroes, shrines, graves etc. from what is alleged to have been his own locality. However, neither J nor E is held to be a violent partisan. Each has a friendly attitude to his neighboring section, the North or the South as the case may be.

The evidences for dating are found in the literary features of the sources, their ideology and the historical allusions found in them. The literary data have been useful mainly in determining the relative dating of the sources in question. The greater simplicity, freshness and vigor of J's style indicate his priority to E. The same conclusion was reached and an approximate date for each source was determined by a comparative study of the ideology of the sources and that of other documents, the dates of which are fixed, namely, Deuteronomy and the first writing prophets, Amos and Hosea. All of these evidences, it will be observed, are internal, that is, they are provided by the sources themselves. These data, supplemented by historical allusions, provided criticism the basis for its absolute dating. In fairness to criticism, perhaps it should be said that the date given, though precisely indicated, is not meant to be anything more than approximate.

One has a suspicion that a reconstruction so arrived at may rest on insecure foundations. In the first place one may question the analysis that relegates much of the theocratic material (for example, Exodus 32, Joshua 24, and so on) to a secondary strand (E_2).[1] Futhermore, due to the dogma of the Hexateuch, the highly important theocratic material[2] of I Samuel has been excluded from consideration. When this is viewed in conjunction with the theocratic material relating to Moses, Joshua and other theocrats, our evidences for locating E both historically and geographically, become much more complete.

The insistence of literary critics that E wrote from a Northern viewpoint, which provides whatever social motivation is

---

[1] Previously treated in discussion of the corpus.

[2] Previous reference has been made to the theocratic character of the E strand.

to be found for E in the Wellhausen reconstruction, lacks justification. The basis for this conclusion, found in the prevalence in this source of names of Northern people and places is not conclusive. In criticizing this position, it may be said that it was not unusual for a Southerner to confine his interest to the North, as did Amos,[1] or to include the North in the scope of his interest, as did Jeremiah.[2] Again, the total area of Hebrew possession was quite small and easily accessible from any point. After all, the geographical location of either J or E is a very minor consideration as compared with the function each was designed to serve in the society and in the age in which it was produced. The geographical origins of J and E cannot be established except with reference to their functional origins. One is not competent to judge the former until one has demonstrated the latter.

These sources were regarded as independent productions originating in different sections of Palestine and designed for different reading publics. Sometime after E was written, perhaps half a century later, an editor found these two sources circulating separately and conceived the idea of uniting them into a composite document. This he did, so it is argued, by retaining representative portions of both J and E and adding occasional harmonistic and editorial notes of his own. Concerning the place where this editor, R^{JE}, lived, whether in the North or South, what his purpose was in this literary endeavor, and what ideas and ideals he himself possessed, no satisfactory explanation has been given. In view of the inadequate motivation offered for this editor's activity, one cannot escape the feeling that this is an arbitrary reconstruction. It leaves one in the dilemma of having to treat with a literary personage but with scarcely any source material on which to base one's conclusions concerning his characteristics and interests. The few harmonistic verses attributed to him could just as well have been inserted in the process of expanding J. It is as plausible to suppose that the composite docu-

---

[1] However, Amos does include Judah in his doom upon the surrounding nations. Amos 2: 4-5. This is climaxed by his pronouncement of doom upon Israel, which occupies the major portion of the book of Amos.

[2] Cf. Jer. 2: 1-4: 4.

ment JE was produced by a work of editorial expansion wrought on the current J document by E when the social necessity arose for such modification, as it is to suppose that an editor combined two parallel histories. To be sure neither J nor E is a complete narrative as it now stands. But this is easily explained. If E edited J, naturally, omissions would be made from the original document. Furthermore, E would make additions only at those points where he could build up his point of view.

From the purely literary standpoint, the Wellhausen hypothesis as it deals with J and E is extremely complex. From the standpoint of social motivation it is not satisfactory. On the Wellhausen theory, we have three authors to account for, one of whom is a very hazy figure. On the theory here proposed, we have but two contributors, for each of whom we have an abundance of source material on which to base our reconstruction.

This may be said to be the crux of our problem both from the literary standpoint and that of social motivation. The proposed hypothesis has the virtue of greater simplicity from the literary angle and it lessens the difficulties encountered in determining the social motivations of the literature.

The absolute dating of J and E, a feature of the Wellhausen hypothesis, may be considered another of its vulnerable points. This emphasis upon exact dating grew out of the use of a methodology developed by men who considered the dating of documents to be one of their primary objects. This brings us to further consideration of the methodology by which the results embodied in the so-called orthodox-critical hypothesis have been attained and a discussion of what may be considered a more adequate methodology.

It is our contention that the defects of the Wellhausen theory, as previously sketched, are traceable directly to an inadequate methodology. It is not inaccurate to say that this methodology was almost exclusively literary both in the techniques employed and in the results achieved. This fact is forcibly impressed on one's mind by a careful reading of the standard works of criticism by the partisans of the Wellhausen hypothesis. Preoccupation with purely literary problems is everywhere the dominant note. Perhaps it would be accurate, however, to say that this designation of the methodology as literary is more strictly true of lower criticism in its work on the texts than it is of higher criticism. In the latter, use is made of historical allusions found in

the documents in the effort to locate them in their historical settings.[1] A more accurate designation, then, would be literary-historical or literary-political.

That this methodology has yielded important results cannot be denied. In the first place, it has freed us from the tyranny of canonical authority, the mechanical theory of inspiration, by establishing the fact that the literature of the Bible has had a history. Before the critic did his work, such a conception of its authority had stifled every attempt to treat the Bible for what it actually is, namely, the literary product of one of the most significant periods of human history, wherein are reflected the experiences of many people cast in real life situations. Such literary work is useful and necessary but it can only be saved from subjectivity by constantly checking it with the social-cultural evolution in which the literature was designed to function.[3]

A feeling, therefore, may be detected in some quarters that criticism has had a tendency to stop short of its main goal, to remain satisfied with the reconstruction of the literary evolution, rather than to use the literature to see accurately the life that lies behind the literary remains. Likewise, there is an uneasiness that we have been subjected overmuch to a new tyranny, that of the finality of the results thus achieved by this methodology. That the latter fear has some justification is seen in the disposition to which allusion has already been made, among Old Testament scholars generally to accept the Wellhausen hypothesis as the final solution of the problem of the historical corpus.

The procedure by which the literary methodology has operated is illustrated in its attack on the problem of the present

---

[1]Comparative study of institutions was also used. Cf. Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of the Hebrew People (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1892; trans. J. Sutherland Black and Alan Menzies).

[2]Critics used the literature as "sources" for facts without first fully determining the social situation which determined not only the character of the literature but the facts themselves.

[3]The translation of dod (75.7), I Sam. 10: 14, 15 as "uncle" may be cited as an example of subjectivity. Study of Canaanite culture has indicated that the dod of Saul was a religious official, a head of the bama, a center of Canaanite religion.

study. As we have seen, it began by noting the difference in the use of divine names. Other criteria were soon added: those of the prevalence of names such as Canaanites or Amorites for the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Canaan, Jacob or Israel for the early partiarch, literary style, use of characteristic phrases, and so on. To these purely literary criteria were added those of ideal, ideology, and institution, all drawn, however, from the literature itself. By their use, the materials were divided into the various strands with great minuteness. The confidence which critics have placed in the method is shown by the way many verses have been analyzed and the parts assigned to the various sources.[1]

The subjectivity to which over confidence in the method leads, is more observable in other parts of the Old Testament, particularly in the poetic literature where metre is also employed as a criterion for recovery of the original text.[2] The frequent liberties taken with the texts by emending them to make them say what the critic thinks they should say are well known. In addition this subjectivity of the critic sometimes manifests itself in a false psychology that demands strict consistency on the part of an author at all times.[3] Sometimes the procedure seems to be that when an author fails in this regard, the text is changed to make him consistent, or the section in question is relegated to an editor.

That the text-critical method would benefit by supplementation by reference to the facts of the social situation from which the literature emerged, whenever those facts can be ascertained, may be illustrated by the use of the criterion of divine names in the interpretation of the historical corpus. This cri-

---

[1]Cf. E. S. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch (New York and Cincinnati, 1918). This analysis is based largely on the results of literary criticism. Many illustrations can be found of analysis of verses into a,b;a,b, c, and so on.

[2]Cf. C. A. Briggs, I. C. C. Psalms, Vol. i, ii, (New York: Scribner's, 1907). Many changes were made in the text by emendation. The dating of the Psalms was a primary objective of the author.

[3]This principle of literary methodology is observable in the older critical view of the pre-Exilic prophets which tended to regard them as consistently pessimistic about the political fate of the Hebrews. Cf. Kemper Fullerton, article "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future," J. B. L., XL-XLI (1921-22), 1f.

terion has been very useful, but in some sections it breaks down when construed as indicating diverse sources. For example, in the J section, Gen. 2: 46-3: 24 the second creation story, we frequently encounter the combination Yahweh Elohim as the name of the deity. The explanation has been offered that two sources have been combined.[1] In view of the reliability of this criterion elsewhere, this is the most natural explanation. When the stories of Gideon and Samson are examined, both names of deity appear in a strange intermixture. The explanation of J and E authorship of separate sources as in some of the early parts of the historical corpus will not apply in these sections of Genesis and Judges. The evidences discoverable from the sources themselves are insufficient to provide a solution. But if it can be established from extra-biblical evidences that Elohim was the earliest name of the deity among the Canaanites and early Hebrew tribes[2] and that many of the traditions incorporated by the Judean historian in his narrative originally used that name, the clue may be provided that will lead to a more satisfactory explanation of the literary phenomena.

In the higher critical aspects of the methodology, extra-biblical reference was largely confined to political events, reigns, battles. Such a social reference, if so it may be called, is hardly adequate. It viewed history as an aristocratic process the important events of which are gathered around a few great names. It failed to recognize the fact that individuals are products of the culture even though they are frequently protesting against it. And culture is the product of the masses of people. The great individual may influence it but he in turn cannot escape being influenced by it.

Literary criticism has not been entirely to blame for the inadequacy of its own methodology. While it often failed to recognize the importance of contemporary culture for the interpretation

---

[1] Cf. John Skinner, Genesis, I. C. C. (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 53.

[2] T. J. Meek, "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," A. J. S. L. XXXVII (1920-21), 101f.
J. M. P. Smith, "Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion," A. J. S. L. XXXII (1915-16), 81f.
T. J. Meek, "Canticles and Tammuz Cult," A. J. S. L. XXXIX (1922), 1f.

of the literature, materials were insufficient from which to determine the nature of that culture.[1] The early critic could never have dreamed that the Hebrews shared a culture common to the whole Near East which so mightily influenced all their institutions. For lack of extra-biblical criteria by which to judge the accuracy of the claims of the Bible itself, early Wellhausen partisans accepted the biblical view that the Hebrews brought with themselves from the desert a unique religious experience.[2] While this may have been only in incipient form, still it was the germ from which grew the flower of Hebrew religion. The influence of the evolutionary theory under the spell of which early critics worked is also seen in their position. The growth of Hebrew religion from this germ to its full flowering, while suffering occasional setbacks, was steady and undiminished, so they concluded. This theory is vulnerable at several points. There is no evidence to substantiate the view that the Hebrews possessed anything unique in the desert above that of other desert dwellers. It would seem, rather, that whatever uniqueness their religion came to possess resulted from the stresses and tensions arising from living in and being molded by the dominant culture and the reactions of certain groups against it.[3] If this viewpoint is sound, it will be a conditioning factor in our interpretation of the literature.

The orthodox-critical view cannot be said, then, to have given due recognition to the influence of Canaanitic culture on the Hebrews. This has been due both to the lack of data[4] for determin-

---

[1]The vast increase in our knowledge of the Near East and its bearing on critical problems was sketched in the previous chapter.

[2]Cf. Article by E. Kautzsch, "Religion of Israel," H. B. D. Extra Vol. pp. 612-734. For bibliography of older works on Hebrew Religion see section, Literature, at end of this article p. 732. The dominant feature of Kautzsch's interpretation of Hebrew Religion is his emphasis on the contribution of Moses.

[3]Renan held that the desert was the birthplace of Monotheism. Cf. Ernest Renan, Studies of Religious History (London: Wm. Heinemann, 1893). This position has now been largely discredited.

[4]There has also been lack of the use of data. This was chiefly due to a certain contempt for the historical value of ancient records. This contempt was based largely on the discovery of factual unreliability in biblical literature. The comparative reliability of ancient records is shown in the study of W. Carleton

ing the nature of the culture of the Canaanites and to the dogma of a unique desert religion. Coupled with this was a view of the Hebrew conquest of Canaan that did not do justice to the facts as they have now been recovered.[1]

One might conclude from both the Bible itself and the orthodox-critical reconstruction of Hebrew life, that, apart from their political relationships, the Hebrews lived in a cultural vacuum, so to speak. We know that they were constant cultural borrowers, as were all other ancient groups.[2] We can no longer posit simple beginnings for Israel.

The view of Hebrew religion as a unique evolutionary product, an ethical monotheistic religion from the beginning, fails to do justice to the influence of the popular religion practiced at the local shrines.[3] It was this type of religion which was most influential in establishing and sanctioning patterns of desire, thought and conduct. Failure to recognize the importance of the popular religion as a powerful influence in shaping Israel's life and customs, was largely due to the influence on the orthodox theory exerted by the evolutionary theory and the Nineteenth Century view of the inevitability of progress. Such a growth necessarily implied a growth from a beginning. Progress was

---

Wood, "The Religion of Canaan," J. B. L. XXXV (1916), 1-163, 163-280.

[1]T. J. Meek, "A Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History," A. J. T. XXIV (1920), 209-216.

D. D. Luckenbill, "On Israel's Origins," A. J. T. XXII (1918), 24-53.

L. B. Paton, "Israel's Conquest of Canaan," J. B. L. XXXII (1913), 1-53.

[2]Cf. T. J. Meek, "Interpenetration of Cultures, etc.," J. R. VII (1927), 244-262.

Cf. H. Gunkel, Legends of Genesis (Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co., 1907). Israel and Babylon, The Influence of Babylon on the Religion of Israel (Philadelphia: Jos. McVey, 1904).

J. M. P. Smith, "Southern Influences on Hebrew Prophecy," A. J. S. L. XXXV (1918), 1-19.

[3]Older treatments of Hebrew religion are found in the following:

Kautzsch, op. cit.

Karl Marti, The Religion of the Old Testament, trans. G. A. Bienemann (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914).

J. P. Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews (Boston and London: Ginn & Co., 1914).

brought about by the deviations for which a few great individuals, the prophets, were responsible. This, however, does not allow for the importance of the system from which the prophets deviated. This has been partly due to the feeling engendered by the Bible itself, that everything Canaanite was evil and, consequently, hostile to Hebrew religion. On the older view, Hebrew religion might be described as a closed system, practically immune to outside influence.

Studies of the ancient Near East, however, disclose a very different social experience undergone by the Hebrews. The common Near Eastern culture which the Hebrews fully shared with their neighbors was definitely a religious culture. The religious rites, as practiced at the popular shrines, not only served to bring satisfaction to basic human desires but they directed and molded those desires. Such a religion of productivity functioned in fulfilling the basic human desire for sustenance values. Recognizing the mystery and significance of life, it was possessed of great value. But dealing as it did largely with physical desire, it lent itself to exploitation. The tensions arising out of the prophetic reaction to the abuses of the dominant system constitute the basis of the Hebrew religious contribution to the world.[1] It is our contention that the literature should be approached from this viewpoint of Hebrew religion rather than from the standpoint of the contribution of a few individuals and in terms of institutions, regarded as phenomena of a predestined system.

It cannot be over emphasized, therefore, that the literary criteria must be supplemented by the most complete reconstruction possible of Hebrew culture and its relationships with cognate cultures, if we are to understand Hebrew literature at all. This grows out of the principle that literature is a reflection of life and must be related to life to be understood. This is even more true of ancient literature in general and Hebrew literature in

---

[1] Cf. Johannes Pederson, Israel, Its Life and Culture (London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1926). This is an admirable treatment of Israelite culture, although its author fails to do full justice to the dominant culture pattern. For a later work that takes cognizance of the latest archaeological finds for the reconstruction of Israel's cultural evolution, Cf. William C. Graham and Herbert G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), pp. 314f.

particular. Any satisfactory interpretation of the literature must do full justice to this functional character. On this characteristic of Hebrew history writing, it may be said further that the Hebrew historian had slight interest in merely recording the facts of history. His primary objective in telling the story of his people's past was to influence his own age. By determining the nature of the culture which molded the historian's work, we prepare the ground for our understanding of the tensions which the author sought to alleviate and the methods he employed for that purpose. This is what is meant by vitalization of the literature.

It is hoped that by the employment of the functional approach here suggested, the literature can be more effectively related to life. It may be possible, thereby, to avoid undue preoccupation with the literary phase of the problem and make some contribution toward a more satisfactory solution of that problem. If the methodology proposed proves to be more adequate than that formerly employed, it is not too much to hope that it may result in greater understanding of the life of the people who produced the literature as well as a fuller appreciation of the literature itself.

← Reduce to 4½" →

CHAPTER II

THE JUDEAN HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE

J used numerous sources in the composition of his history. Among these were aeteological stories that explained the origins of customs long practiced by the Hebrews and their neighbors, stories that explained phenomena that were puzzling to the ancient mind, for example, the suffering caused by child birth, the necessity for human toil, man's aversion to snakes, and so on. J also employed traditions of the patriarchal ancestors of the race, stories of tribal heroes who were local leaders in times of crisis, and traditions dealing with the events and personages connected with the establishment and early events of the monarchy. These he brought into a connected narrative that set forth Israel's history from creation[1] down at least as far as the consolidation of the Hebrew tribes under the monarchy.

In our effort to ascertain the characteristics of the Judean History, its social motivations and the age in which it was produced, we shall begin our examination with the J "book" of Judges. Here the stratification showing the ancient source, J's modification of it and later editorial expansion, is more clearly discernible than elsewhere in the historical corpus.

The story of the Manassite hero, Gideon[2] offers a good example of this stratification.[3] After removal of the Deuteronomic introduction, contained in Jg. 6: 1-5, the JE story begins. Judges 6: 6-10 is clearly late, showing characteristics of a later expansion.[4] The J story begins with the appearance to Gideon of the angel of Yahweh in human form, who apprises him of the great danger

---

[1] Gen. 2: 4bf.

[2] Judges 6, 7, 8.

[3] The literary problems of the "book" of Judges are less complex, from the standpoint of sources, than those found elsewhere in the corpus. From the study of this "book" we may be able to develop criteria for the study of the remainder of the corpus.

[4] Heightening of the miraculous, reference to Yahweh's sending a prophet to the Israelites are evidences of lateness.

confronting his people, brought about by Midianite raids, and of his duty to recognize his responsibility in the crisis. Before this angelic visitation, Gideon had apparently been hopeless of doing anything about the situation. The account of this interview between the angel of Yahweh and Gideon comprises the section, vv 11-24. In this section it will be observed that the name Yahweh predominates as the name of the deity.

VV 25-32 interrupt the main thread of the story of the political crisis. Obviously, it is an attempt by the author of vv 11-24 to explain why Gideon was also known by the name Jerubbaal. The author is at pains to explain away this Baal combination name for his readers who apparently knew their hero by that name and would not recognize him by the name Gideon.[1] We are told that Gideon's father possessed a Baal altar. The author makes no attempt to conceal the fact that his hero's father, at least, was a Baal worshiper. Accordingly, Yahweh is said to have commanded Gideon to tear down this Baal altar and cut down the Asherah.[2] He is further commanded to replace these pagan symbols with an altar of Yahweh on which he is to present a burnt offering.[3] Great furore is caused by this act.[4] The Judean historian connected the name Jerubbaal with the incident, the name Jerubbaal having been given to Gideon by his fellow townsmen.[5] The explanation of the name Jerubbaal is found in the words put by the narrator into the mouth of Gideon's Baal worshiping father, Joash, who sides with his son against the wrath of the irate Baalists: "Let Baal take his own part, for his altar has been torn down."[6] The word Jerubbaal is misconstrued here, however, because the word will not bear the reflexive meaning given to it.[7] It does not mean that Baal will contend for himself but simply that Baal will contend, implying that Baal will contend for the one who bears his name.

---

[1] Cf. William C. Graham and Herbert G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), pp. 158-160.

[2] V 25. [3] V 26. [4] V 27. [5] V 30. [6] V 31.

[7] יְרֻבַּעַל from יְרֻבַּ and בָּעַל, to contend, verb is Qal form, not Niphal. The name Gideon means hewer and is derived from the act of cutting down the pagan altar and the sacred pole. גִּדְעוֹן from גָּדַע to hew.

Several facts are apparent. The obvious purpose of the story of Gideon's name and the fact that it intrudes into the main narrative point to the conclusion that it was not a part of the original Jerubbaal story. The incident was probably invented by the J writer including the account of the origin of the fictitious name, Gideon, to make of his hero a loyal Yahwist. The most natural interpretation of the whole passage is that the name Jerubbaal, a good Baal compound name, was Gideon's original name and that both he and his people were Baal worshipers. The name Joash, a Yahweh name, given to Gideon's father, also has an interesting significance. It likewise was probably an invention of the J historian. By it J sought to leave the impression that the Manassites originally were Yahwists and from Yahwism lapsed into Baalism. If this interpretation is correct it points to the conclusion that the Manassite hero story was Baalistic in its origins and Elohim was the name used for deity.

The original story begins at Jg. 6: 33. This section runs to Jg. 7: 2. In this portion we find a puzzling intermixture of Elohim and Yahweh names of deity. If the theory of Elohistic origins of the original story is correct, an explanation of the presence of the two names is to be found in J's editing of the original story. His Yahwization of the tradition was further accomplished by substituting, at intervals, the name Yahweh for Elohim. Complete elimination of the name Elohim, however, would have been unwise, inasmuch as a favorable reception for the story in a completely Yahwized form by those readers who were used to it in its original form would have been jeopardized. This section, Jg. 6: 33-7: 2, recounts the divine authentication of Gideon's call. This is accomplished by the presence of dew on the fleece which Gideon has placed on the threshing floor.[1] The insertion of the name Gideon at 7: 1 is clearly an addition to the original text.

Judges 7: 2-8 is late and belongs to the strand comprised of Jg. 6: 7-10; 7: 2-8, 16-23; 8: 4-28. A careful reading of these portions indicates that they constitute a late expansion of J with very different characteristics from those of the J story and, of

---

[1] v 37.

course, differently motivated.[1]

Judges 7: 14 relates the incident of Gideon's visit to the Midianite camp where he overhears the telling of a dream by one of the Midianites to his comrade. It is given as further authentication[2] of the promise of victory to Gideon. The warrior dreamed that a barley crust came tumbling into the Midianite camp and rolling against a tent, caused it to fall flat. This section with Jg. 6: 33-72, and 7: 23-8: 3 make up the original Manassite story, or what remains of it, after J's editing. Judges 8: 29-32, a Yahwistic addition, brings the original J story to an end.

The principle addition J made is 6: 11-32. Let us examine this section with the view of determining J's predominant interests. To Yahweh credit is given for Gideon's heroism. J devotes considerable space to his description of the theophany by which Gideon was inspired and energized for his undertaking. In very anthropomorphic form, the angel of Yahweh comes and sits down to converse with Gideon.[3] To impress upon the minds of his readers the fact that it actually was Yahweh who prompted Gideon to undertake his difficult task, the author represents Gideon as reluctant to believe that it was really Yahweh with whom he conversed and that he could make good in his promise to be with him and give him success.[4] J cleverly embodies in the story his view that Yahweh has been traditionally regarded as responsible for Hebrew success and greatness, by putting in Gideon's mouth these words: "Where are all his wonderful deeds, which our fathers recounted to us, saying, 'Was it not out of Egypt that Yahweh brought us?'"[5] J makes his point all the more effectively by representing Gideon's reluctance as finally overcome by a final authentication which no longer left any doubt in Gideon's mind. This consisted in a miraculous consuming of a food offering. The angel Yahweh merely touched the meat and unleavened cakes and fire burst forth and consumed them.[6] J makes this theophany the dominant feature of Gideon's preparation for his task.

---

[1]This strand is a part of the theocratic expansion of the J narrative and will be taken up in the next chapter.

[2]Along with 6: 37-40, Dew on the Fleece, constitutes the divine authentication in the original Manassite story.

[3]Jg. 6: 11. [4]Jg. 4: 13, 18. [5]V 13. [6]V 21.

It will be observed that J does not represent Gideon as a medium through whom the divine power might operate to bring about victory. Rather, he leaves much for human accomplishment. "Go in this strength of yours, and save Israel . . . . ," he tells him.[1] The most that is promised to him is that Yahweh is sending him, that he will be with him, and that he is not to die because he has seen Yahweh face to face.[2]

The evidence strongly favors the view, that J has Yahwized an old Pagan story, which was Elohistic in its religious origins and transmission.[3] He manipulates the facts of the incident of Midianite oppression and the heroism of the Baalist Jerubbaal to make his point that it was Yahweh who called Gideon and was responsible for his success.

The story of the Gileadite hero, Jephthah, offers another interesting example of J's treatment of his sources.[4] The Deuteronomic framework is found in Jg. 10: 6-18 and 12: 7. The story proper, then begins at 11: 1.[5] At the outset, the extraordinary character of Jephthah's birth is related. He is the son of a harlot, the offspring of a cult union, which fact precludes the possibility of his sharing in his father's estate. For this reason he becomes an outcast from his family and the leader of a marauding band much on the order of David, the type of individual that delighted the fancy of ancient story tellers. The circumstances surrounding Jephthah's birth thus point to the pagan character of the story.

---

[1] V 14. [2] VV 12, 14, 23.

[3] Karl Budde, Das Buch der Richter, pp. xii-xv.
George Foote Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1910), pp. xxxiiif., introduction, and treatment of Gideon story. Both scholars hold that J and E strands are found in the "book" of Judges. But both seek to make the analysis on the basis of the criterion of divine names. The stratification in Judges is early E or Elohistic, Yahwistic, and theocratic.

[4] Judges 10: 6-12: 7.

[5] Judges 11: 11b seems to be out of place and it is suggested that it should follow 6: 31. It probably refers to Gideon's act of offering sacrifice immediately before he began his conquest. The "words" spoken of in VII b refer to the vow made at that time.

At the importunity of the elders of Gilead, Jephthah consented to lead their forces against the Ammonites. After the arrangement was completed whereby Jephthah became chief of the Gileadites, he went to Mizpeh where he consulted Yahweh before beginning his undertaking.[1]

A prominent feature of the story is the vow of Jephthah to Yahweh that if he will deliver the Ammonites into his power, he will offer as a burnt-offering the first person he should meet coming out of the door of his house following the victory.[2] Whom should he meet but his only daughter! Before he carries out his vow, Jephthah grants her request that she be permitted to go with her companions on the mountains where for two months she could bewail her virginity. It is explained that following the incident, it became "a custom in Israel for the Israelite maidens to go annually to commemorate the daughter of Jephthah, the Gileadite, for four days in the year."[3]

Evidently, the main object of the story in its original form is to explain the origin of this custom, later adopted by the Hebrews. That the custom of virgins bewailing their virginity is pagan in its origin is seen from its fertility motif, prominent in the productivity pattern dominant all over the Near East. Further confirmation of the pagan character of the story is found in the name Jephthah. It is from the Hebrew verb, פתח, meaning open. It is the Qal form and means, El opens.[4]

J appears to have made few additions to the story. If our view is correct concerning the non-Yahwistic character of the story, possibly Yahwization by the substitution at intervals of the name Yahweh for Elohim as the name of deity was the extent of the changes J made.

Explanation of the current Hebrew cult ritual, referred to above, was only secondary with J. His great objective was to offer an explanation of Jephthah's greatness and success. In this, his view is similar to that which he held for Gideon. The spirit of Yahweh inspired him to begin his desperate undertaking.[5] J is per-

---

[1] Ch. 11: 29-30. [2] 11: 34. [3] V 40.

[4] Brown, Driver and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Boston and New York: Houghton & Mifflin Co., 1907), p. 834.

[5] 11: 29.

haps less explicit here than in the case of Gideon in regard to the manner of this initial divine call and inspiriting. He is content to say merely that "the spirit of Yahweh inspired Jephthah." But J has left no doubt in his readers' minds that Jephthah was a thoroughgoing Yahwist for whose success Yahweh was directly responsible.[1] It becomes clear that J's great purpose in retelling the Jephthah story, was to show that in a time of crisis, Yahweh prepared a leader to bring the Israelites safely through the emergency and to further them in their progress toward their great goal.[2]

The Samson story[3] recounts the adventures of another Northern hero whom J brings into his succession of deliverers. This Danite hero arose in the emergency of the Philistine crisis. The story has many elements of popular folk lore that must have made it a favorite around the campfire, such as, Samson's pranks, his miraculous strength and the secret of it and the way in which he finally brought destruction to his enemies.

The Samson story has pagan characteristics. The name Samson may indicate a connection with sun worship.[4] This fact seen in connection with the numerous appearances of the name Elohim point undeniably to the pagan origin of the story. The theory of sources as applied in Genesis, if applied to this phenomenon of alternation of divine names in the Samson story, again would break down. The name Yahweh appears throughout the story in sections that are clearly original. The most plausible explanation here, as in the Gideon and Jephthah stories, is that J has injected the name Yahweh at these places.

There are passages originally Yahwistic and added by J. The first of these we shall consider is Jg. 13: 15-23, which re-

---

[1]By substituting at intervals, the name Yahweh for Elohim, as he did in the Gideon story, J makes it clear that Yahweh is the Elohim of Israel, 11: 23, 25.

[2]For J, the grand objective of the Hebrews is the political status of Nationhood. Yahweh's initial call to Abraham included this promise. Gen. 12: 1, 2.

[3]Judges 13-16.

[4]The derivation of the name Samson from the word Sun is clear in the Hebrew. שִׁמְשׁוֹן Shimshon--Samson, שֶׁמֶשׁ Shemesh--sun. The name of Samson's father Manoah, מָנוֹחַ, from the verb form נוּחַ, to rest, means resting place or rest.

7

counts the theophany to Manoah, Samson's father.[1] The similarity between this and the theophany to Gideon[2] is at once apparent. Here the authentication is accomplished in the same manner as previously, that is, a food offering is consumed before his eyes.[3] Manoah did not at first recognize the divine apparition as the angel of Yahweh. He was finally convinced by the divine demonstration and, as in the case of Gideon, expresses his fear to his wife for having seen the divine visage.[4] Manoah's identification of the divine visitant with Elohim,[5] may be a device of J to impress on his Northern readers that this Elohim was none other than Yahweh. This dedication before his birth brought Yahweh's blessing upon Samson.[6] But this was not sufficient when crises came. It was Yahweh's repeated energizing that enabled Samson to rise to superhuman heights as occasion demanded.[7] The popular explanation of Samson's strength was that it resided in his hair. In the interest of convincing his readers who were long familiar with the story, that Yahweh was the true deity, he shows them that they were wrong about their theory of Samson's strength. Yahweh was really the secret of his power. J accomplished this by the addition of several verses: 14: 6, 19; 15: 14; 16: 28. In the first three references identical phraseology is used: "Then the Spirit of Yahweh came rushing upon him. . . . ." Samson is thus made into a thorough going "theophanic" hero. He was specially called in this crisis. He is only a deliverer in a temporary emergency, however, - a man of the hour.

J's anxiety to explain the secret of Samson's power and the evident predominance of Elohim in the original narrative point to the conclusion that the Danites were originally non-Yahwists. At the time when J wrote, there is, obviously, still the problem in the North of apostasy from Yahweh or the prevalence of Baalism to contend with. Probably the latter represents the true situation.

Several facts become apparent from our study of these tribal stories and J's treatment of them. They indicate a period

---

[1] The name Yahweh predominates. The section is a unit in itself describing Manoah's experience with the angel of Yahweh.

[2] Jg. 6: 11-32. [3] VV 19-22. [4] V 22.

[5] V 22. [6] V 25. [7] V 25b.

8

of independence when the tribes were acting alone or in small coalitions, in times of emergency. Ephraim's complaint to Manasseh about not being permitted to share in the latter's military glory plainly indicates a tendency toward consolidation, however.[1] J furthers the ideal of unification by leaving the impression that the judges were a succession of leaders. The Deuteronomist carries the idea still farther by regarding each judge as a ruler of all the tribes.[2] While J does not change the stories that come into his hands sufficiently to distort the true character of the events, he accomplishes his unification by his process of Yahwization. All of these heroes belong in the same succession of secular leaders who were called to their task and prepared for it by the same deity.

J begins his history with creation.[3] His broad human interest is shown in the aetiological stories[4] which he includes in his narrative: the creation and fall of man,[5] origin of the giants,[6] story of the Flood,[7] curse of Canaan,[8] and the Tower of Babel.[9] Several of these stories, for example, the creation and flood stories, have Babylonian parallels and were long in the possession of the Hebrews, possibly having been brought to Canaan by the Hyksos. In all probability, they were Elohistic in their origin and early transmission. Very likely they were in circulation in Judah as well as in the North. If so, the process of Yahwization could have gone on for a considerable time before J in-

---

[1]Jg. 8: 1-3. The Song of Deborah shows a much larger coalition, Judges 5. The tribe of Judah had not yet risen to prominence in the Judges period, however.

[2]Throughout the Deuteronomic framework of Judges. Cf. Jg. 8: 28; 10: 3-5; 12: 7; 16: 31.

[3]Gen. 2: 4bf.

[4]The priestly editor has greatly expanded these stories to account for the origins of religious institutions.

[5]Gen. 2: 46--3: 24.

[6]Gen. 6: 1-4.

[7]Gen. 6: 5--9: 17, with additions by the priestly editor.

[8]Gen. 9: 18-29.

[9]Gen. 11: 1-9.

corporated the stories in his narrative. J's strong Yahwizing tendency was doubtless responsible for putting Yahweh back at the very beginning - at creation, "Yahweh Elohim made the heavens and the earth."[1] This combination name of deity and the intermixture of divine names elsewhere would seem to be convincing proof that the explanation here offered is valid. The known pagan character of some of the stories as previously indicated, adds additional confirmation.[2]

By beginning his narrative with creation, the very act of bringing forth the heavens and the earth, which is the work of Yahweh, J adds greatly to Yahweh's prestige and furthers the process of racial unification. By so doing, J also adds to the prestige of Israel. The god of creation by his own act has chosen Israel to be his own people. The succession of Israel's deliverers is thereby brought under the sway of the divine creator.

Hebrew history proper begins with the call of Abraham.[3] It was at Yahweh's instigation that Abraham left his home and kindred, to journey to a land that he would show him. The promise that Yahweh makes to Abraham is significant, "I will make a great nation of you."[4] J here connects the conception of the Hebrew

---

[1]The critical analysis of the "Hexateuch" into the various sources will, for the most part, remain unchallenged. The present study is based on the analysis of E. S. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch (New York and Cincinnati, 1918). A vast amount of detailed work has been and is being done on the analytical and exegetical features of the texts. That this work is indispensable goes without saying. The present study aims at a broader approach to these sources to determine their nature and origin, based on typical passages throughout the extent of the sources, passages that are indisputably J or E as the case may be. If we succeed in our objective of determining the functional character and social provenance of the J and E strands, our study may be useful as an aid in the more detailed textual work.

[2]Cf. R. W. Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1912). Note especially the parallels to creation and flood stories.
Hermann Gunkel, Legends of Genesis (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1907).

[3]Genesis 12.

[4]Gen. 12: 2.

Nation with the call of a single racial ancestor, Abraham. Not only will he make of Abraham's descendants a great nation, but he promises them the land of Canaan for their possession.[1] The fact of descent from a common ancestor makes the Hebrews one people. This racial oneness constitutes for J a great bond of unity of the Hebrews. Everywhere this fact receives emphasis in the J stratum. They are one race under the domination of one deity. The direct call of Yahweh to Abraham prepared the patriarch for his great responsibility.

J records a theophany to Abraham in which he renews his promise of possession of the land and the promise of an heir.[2] The confirmation of the theophany seems incomplete, a later expansion having occurred at this point.[3]

J's idea of special selection appears in the story of the putting away of Abraham's concubine, Hagar, and her son Ishmael.[4] J is interested in racial purity, but even more in racial unity and continuity. The line is continued through Isaac, who is born to Abraham and Sarah in their old age.[5] J's concern for racial purity is shown in the story of Rebekah, who is brought from the land of Abraham's birth to be the wife of Isaac.[6] He is unwilling that the racial blood should be contaminated by intermarriage with the Canaanites, an idea that was to be increasingly emphasized by later editors.[7] In a theophany to Isaac Yahweh renews the promise made to Abraham, namely, that of possession of

---

[1] Gen. 12: 7.

[2] Genesis 15. This passage has received theocratic expansion. Cf. VV 5, 13-15.

[3] See above.

[4] Gen. 16: 4-14.

[5] Gen. 21: 1f. With theocratic and priestly expansions. The miraculous character of Isaac's birth also emphasizes J's idea of special selection.

[6] Gen. 24: 1-67. This section is entirely J.

[7] J's interest in racial purity is not motivated by cultural considerations. His purpose is rather to show the homogeneous character of the Hebrew race.

the land, numerous descendants, and a great nation.[1]

The racial line is finally narrowed to Jacob and his descendants. The relations of the two sons of Isaac, Jacob and Esau, the enmity between them, and the evident hostility of the author to Esau as set forth by J, probably reflect the actual historical situation in relation to Edom.[2]

J has the same motifs in his account of Jacob as in the earlier patriarchs. Jacob also returns to his native land Haran, to secure a wife.[3] The familiar theophany occurs and the promise made to Abraham and Isaac is repeated to him.[4] Jacob succeeds in his mission and secures from among his kin two wives and two concubines. J then recounts the births of Jacob's twelve sons.[5] This makes his ideal of racial unity complete. The twelve sons of Jacob bring forth the twelve Hebrew tribes which go back in a direct line to one ancestor. However, the fact that some were the product of concubinage reflects a loose connection of some of the tribes with the main body of Israelites. The Northern tribes Dan, Naphthali, Gad, and Asher who were longer in residence in Palestine than the more important central and Southern tribes are represented as sons of the concubines, Bilhah and Zilpah.[6] The four Southern tribes Reuban, Simeon, Levi and Judah, and Issachar and Zebulun are sons of Leah, while Joseph and Benjamin are sons of the more favored wife, Rachel.

A very ancient story describing a strange theophany to Jacob, apparently inserted by J in his narrative, reflects the original Elohistic character of the patriarchal stories.[7] Jacob is said to have wrestled with "a man" until daybreak during which the socket of Jacob's thigh became dislocated. In its origins, the story was obviously designed to explain a food custom, the prohibition against eating the food of the thigh.[8] The change of

---

[1] Gen. 26: 1-33. A typical J section, the names Yahweh and Elohim intermingle.

[2] Gen. 27: 1f. Cf. I Ki. 11: 14-25; II Ki. 8: 20-22.

[3] Gen. 28: 10.

[4] Gen. 28: 13-16.

[5] Gen. 29: 31-30: 24.

[6] Gen. 30: 4-14.

[7] Gen. 32: 24-32.

[8] An indication of J's sympathy toward cultic regulations.

name Jacob to Israel may reflect a change in the status of the Hebrews probably at the time of the conquest.[1] The prevalence of Elohim as the name of deity and the presence of the place name Peniel, an El compound name, is further indication of the non-Yahwistic origin of the story. Practically no Jahwization has been done.

Hebrew history is continued by J in the events surrounding the career of Joseph. The basis of his brothers' jealousy and his subsequent passage to Egypt is laid in the fact of his father's greater love for him as manifested by the gift of a beautiful cloak.[2] This aroused the jealousy of his brothers who plotted his destruction.[3] It turned out that at Judah's instigation Joseph was sold to a band of Ishmaelites who in turn sold him to Potiphar, an officer of the Pharaoh.[4]

The climax of the Joseph stories is, of course, the Egyptian sojourn of the twelve tribes occasioned by a famine in the land of Canaan.[5] The Joseph saga prepares for this event. J heightens the critical aspects of this period of Hebrew history. As on other similar occasions, a deliverer is raised up to bring the Hebrews safely through the emergency. On this occasion it is Joseph. J accounts for Joseph's success, as he did in the later Judges stories, by attributing it entirely to Yahweh's inspiration. "Yahweh was with Joseph. . . . . Yahweh made everything prosper with him which he undertook."[6] The story reaches its climax with the settlement of all the Israelites in their new home, the land of Goshen.[7]

---

[1]Gen. 24: 28. [2]Gen. 37: 3-4.

[3]Gen. 37: 3-4 (J). The theocratic expansion offers a different reason, vv 5-11. He is said to have had a dream in which he is represented as exercising authority over his brothers, a premonition of the later relationship of Joseph and his brothers.

[4]Gen. 37: 26, 27; 39: 1.

[5]The J section, Genesis 38, which recounts the exploits of Judah, indicates the very early residence in Canaan of the tribe of Judah. It reflects the prevalence of the practice of sacred prostitution. The greatest importance of the chapter is its bearing on the place of Judah in the reconstruction of early Hebrew History.

[6]Gen. 39: 2, 21, 23. [7]Gen. 47: 1-5.

The emphases which J seeks to make here are, as before, the unity of the Israelites in this first national crisis, and their deliverance by a Yahweh-inspired savior. The tradition of the Egyptian sojourn was doubtlessly of Northern origin and circulation. J does not rob the Northern hero Joseph of the glory belonging to him. He merely explains the secret of his success. In so doing, the Southern deity, Yahweh receives credit for the victory. He does give Judah a prominent place, however, as the spokesman for the other brothers. J makes him the representative of Israel in negotiations with Joseph relative to residence in Egypt.[1]

Thus the patriarchal history is brought to a close. The unity of the history is preserved even in the matter of the burial of the patriarchs. Jacob's last charge to his sons is that he be buried back in Canaan, the land of promise. In fact the burial is to occur in the same place where the bones of Abraham and Isaac and their wives reposed.[2]

But the rescue from one crisis only led to another. The growth in numbers of the Hebrews and their consequent threat to the Egyptians brought oppression upon them. They were pressed into forced labor by the Pharaoh and used by him in his building enterprises.[3] So intolerable became the oppression that the Hebrew spirit could no longer bear it. Moreover, for J the narrative must move on. Yahweh has promised a land and a nation to the people whom he has chosen. Consequently, a deliverer must be raised up to bring the Israelites out of their new crisis and to send them on their course toward the grand consummation, nationhood.

When we first meet Moses in the J narrative, he is a full-grown man.[4] Because of his indiscretion in slaying an Egyptian who had killed a fellow Hebrew, Moses was forced to flee Egypt. He finds shelter among the Midianites where he takes as wife, Zipporah the daughter of Reuel, the priest of Midian. Here he began the rearing of his family and apparently intended to make

---

[1]Gen. 46: 28. [2]Gen. 49: 29-33.

[3]Ex. 1: 8-12, with priestly expansions, vv 1-5, 7.

[4]Ex. 2: 11.

his residence permanently among the Midianites. But suddenly something happened that completely changed the direction of his life. "The Angel of Yahweh appeared to him. . . . ."[1] Moses experienced one of the classic theophanies of religious history. Out of the bush that burned and was not consumed appeared the Angel of Yahweh.[2] When Moses turned aside, there sounded the divine voice. Yahweh informed him that he was fully cognizant of the plight of the Hebrews under their Egyptian taskmasters and that he proposed to rescue them and bring them to the glorious land he had already promised them.[3] Moses was to be his instrument for effecting the rescue. He is to return to Egypt and begin his task by informing the elders of Yahweh's appearance to him and his charge to his servant. He is to impress on their minds the significant fact that it really is Yahweh who is behind this movement, the very god of their fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.[4] The clear implication here is that the early Hebrews used the name Elohim for their deity. Either naïvely believing that Yahweh was thus early worshiped or purely as a matter of strategy, J thus makes Yahweh the Hebrew deity from these early beginnings.

In keeping with J's strategy elsewhere, he represents the people as reluctant to believe that Yahweh is actually the moving spirit. This gives him his opportunity of emphasizing his point of Yahweh's place in Hebrew history. His authentication to Moses was, of course, accomplished by the burning bush incident. Yahweh provided Moses with means of his personal authentication to the elders. These consisted in the staff that was turned into a snake and the leprous hand.[5] In the course of the deliverance wrought by Moses, Yahweh gives him constant direction.[6] Yahweh, himself, prepares the way for the deliverance by bringing plagues on the Egyptians, but the actual leadership of the people falls to

---

[1]Ex. 3: 2.

[2]Ex. 3: 2-22, with theocratic additions.

[3]VV 7-8. [4]VV 16-18. [5]Ex. 4: 1-9.

[6]Ex. 4: 23; 6: 1; 7: 14; 8: 1.

Moses.[1] At the destruction wrought by the last plague, the striking down of the first-born of the Egyptians, the people followed Moses' instructions and the escape was finally consummated.[2] After the emergence, Moses bade the Israelites commemorate their deliverance by keeping the passover. He further reminded them of the purpose for which Yahweh had brought them safely out of bondage, namely to lead them to the land he had promised to their fathers.[3] Everywhere in J we find these familiar motifs. He does not permit his readers to lose sight of the goal toward which Israelite history moves, namely, a nation under a divinely appointed head.

The usual picture we have of Moses is that of a lawgiver but this is mainly due to the theocratic expansion of J's narrative. J's picture of Moses is that of the typical theophanic deliverer. He presents the mountain experience of Moses wherein Yahweh calls him to the top of the mountain and makes a covenant with him as the representative of the people. The terms of the covenant are very simple. In return for their obedience, Yahweh promises that the Israelites shall be "a holy nation" to him.[4] Again, the ideas of unity and nationhood are emphasized. The J narrative has been greatly expanded at this point by the addition of the E decalogue and the Covenant Code.[5] J merely includes the details of the mountain theophany and the terms of the covenant there established. To the great consternation of the people, Yahweh appeared in fire and smoke.[6] The people are reminded that they may not come up to the top; only their divinely chosen representative was permitted this privilege.[7] J's theory is that Israel's great destiny lies in the hands of a succession of divinely chosen leaders. He is monotonous in his repetition of the promise made to the fathers.[8] It is the thread that runs through his entire narrative.

---

[1]The miraculous character of the entire story of the emergence from Egypt, is intended by J to convey the idea of Yahweh's supreme concern for his chosen people and the part he has played in their history.

[2]Ex. 12: 29-34. [3]Ex. 13: 3-16. [4]Ex. 19: 3b-9.

[5]The E Decalogue, Ex. 20: 1-17, and the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20: 22--23: 33 are theocratic.

[6]Ex. 19: 18. [7]Ex. 19: 20-25. [8]Ex. 33: 1.

16

After further request for information about Yahweh's instructions, Moses is permitted to see Yahweh as he passes by. The theophany comes to a climax in the actual making of the covenant which merely seals the promise previously made. The covenant relationship of the Israelites must be exclusively with Yahweh. When they enter the promised land, they must avoid making a covenant with the inhabitants and their deities. Yahweh will not countenance a divided loyalty. But the Mosaic covenant, it will be observed, was only temporary. It was merely preparatory to the covenant made on the occasion of the setting up of the nation when they will have become established in Canaan. The giving of the ten words, the so-called J decalogue,[1] completes the events of Moses' Sinai experience. It will be noted that this code is exclusively ritualistic and cannot be considered as a legal code by which the affairs of the nation may be ordered.

The import of the Sinai theophany to Moses in J's narrative is solely that of a further authentication of Yahweh's choice of Moses as the deliverer at a time of peril, and a promise of his continued favor until the final consummation is reached. In addition, the covenant is entered into by the two parties, Yahweh and the Israelites, wherein Yahweh agrees to bring to realization the promise made originally to Abraham. The picture of Moses we get from J is not unlike that of other deliverers. If he rose to greater heights it was because the crisis demanded a leadership of greater capacity. In no case does J represent Moses in the light of lawgiver.

The account of the later experiences in the desert[2] continues the movement toward Canaan under the leadership of Moses. At the constant direction of Yahweh, he deals with the complaints of the people and leads them through the vicissitudes of the desert

---

[1]It may be that the reference here to the second set of stone tablets (34: 1-5) is editorial and harmonistic and not a part of the original J narrative. It may have been necessarily injected here because of the breaking of the first tablets on the occasion of the Golden Calf incident and Moses' anger caused by that event. In the latter instance, Yahweh did not write but passed in front of Moses proclaiming the ten words.

[2]Num. 10: 29f.

experience. The J material is very scanty at this point. The author merely records the sending of spies and their report,[1] the complaints of the people and Moses' intercession with Yahweh in their behalf,[2] the encounter with Balak, King of Moab and the parables of Balaam.[3]

It will be observed that J represents the twelve tribes as participating in the desert wanderings and the journey through Edom and Moab as they had all shared the Egyptian experience. But so far as the historical movements of the Israelites are concerned, J's idealization ceases with the entry into Canaan. The meagre remaining J material on the conquest which is embedded in the "book" of Joshua and in Jg. 1: 1-2: 5, represents the conquest as accomplished slowly and by the independent efforts of the separate tribes.[4] As we have seen, J is similarly realistic in his treatment of the judges' period. This unification of the tribal traditions in the later period was of necessity less complete for J than for the more remote period which lent itself more readily to such idealization.

J's account of the founding of the monarchy is found in I Sam. 9: 1-10: 16. The story is naïvely told. Saul is represented as entirely innocent of the events that are transpiring. As a youth, he is sent on an errand by his father to find his lost asses. Here he comes in contact with a country seer, a man of God, Samuel. Samuel[5] aids him in his search but has a more important matter to take up with him, namely, that of the kingship. All this took place at the instigation of Yahweh who communicated to Samuel the information that Saul was coming to him and the instruction that the latter was to be anointed a leader of Israel.[6]

---

[1]Num. 13: 17, 19, 21-29. [2]Num. 14: 11-21.

[3]Num. 22: 6-7, 11, 17-18, 22-35; 24: 1-25. The Balaam parables play up the motif of special choice. Yahweh overruled Balak's command to Baalam to curse Israel.

[4]Josh. 15: 13, 15-19; 16: 10; 17: 11-18; 19: 47.

[5]Samuel is an El name. Samuel is said to have been a "man of Elohim." The non-Yahwistic origin is clear.

[6]I Sam. 9: 15f.

The existing situation was the oppression of the Israelites at the hands of the Philistines. Samuel carried out Yahweh's order in strictest secrecy.[1] Saul was bidden to return and whatever the spirit of Yahweh directed him to do, that he should obediently perform. The usual confirmation followed. Saul is to meet two men on his return who will tell him of the whereabouts of the lost asses.[2] J informs his readers that these signs took place that very day. They are represented as Yahweh's means of authentication of himself to Saul. In addition, the Spirit of God seized upon Saul and changed him into another man so that he prophesied ecstatically.[3] Saul instantly became a thoroughgoing Yahwist. The immediate occasion for Saul's public acclamation was the siege of Jabesh-Gilead by the Ammonites.[4] Saul arose to the occasion nobly and his public anointing at Gilgal followed.[5]

Several significant features of J's account of the establishment of the monarchy are at once apparent. Yahweh was responsible both for its establishment and the selection of Saul. There is no hint in J of any disapproval of the monarchy. But it was done through the agency of Samuel. Saul experienced an energizing by Yahweh later, but at the outset it was mediated through Samuel. J is not unfriendly to Saul but a lesser place for him in the succession of Yahweh-called and inspired leaders of Israel may be thus indicated by J. Saul had only slightly more jurisdiction than one of the judges. For J, Saul is only an interim ruler before the great consummation. The united nation was yet to be established. That was the task of J's great hero David.

J's preference for David is indicated in his story of Saul's jealousy of David because of the latter's superior military prowess.[6] In this way J introduces his hero to his readers. He continues his account by relating David's Marriage to Michal, Saul's daughter, and the great feat by which he won her.[7] Although realistically set forth, at every point J exalts David's prowess over that of his contemporaries. J's conception of the messianic character of the Kingship is clearly set forth in the story of David's kindness in sparing the life of his enemy, Saul.[8]

---

[1] I Sam. 9: 27. [2] I Sam. 10: 2f. [3] I Sam. 10: 9f.

[4] I Samual 11. [5] I Sam. 11: 15. [6] I Sam. 18:6-11.

[7] I Sam. 18: 20-30 [8] I Samuel 26.

David refused to take Saul's life, with these words, "Destroy him not, for who can lay his hand upon the Lord's Messiah and be innocent."[1] David shows the same attitude in his treatment of Saul's son and heir, Ishbaal. The latter's slayers, on bringing Ishbaal's head to David, were put to death at David's command.[2] In this, J has probably correctly represented David's view of the Kingship. David held a resolute view of the hereditary character of the office as seen in his desire to have Michal, Saul's daughter, his wife, returned to him. This, he held, would strengthen his claim to the throne. David's idea of the royal continuity is further shown by his choice of Solomon as his successor. With this, J probably ends his history,[3] the monarchy being safely established in the line of David.

J's passage dealing with David's induction into office at Hebron contains several significant statements of what transpired on that occasion.[4] The earlier account which fell into J's hands and which he expanded, states that the Elders of Israel made a covenant with David and anointed David King over Israel (v 3). J's expansion relates that "all the tribes of Israel came to David to Hebron."[5] J's conception of racial unity is again expressed in these words put in the mouths of the Northern tribesmen: "Behold, we are your bone and your flesh."[6] The rest of the statement merely indicates Saul's secondary character in J's opinion and implies that already during Saul's reign a covenant relationship had been in effect between David and Yahweh, "You shall shepherd my people Israel and you shall be leader over Israel." Thus early, David had been accorded the preeminence over Saul.

J's conception of the permanency of David's house here established, is expressed in the words of Abigail: "Yahweh will surely make of my lord a secure house, for my lord is fighting the wars of Yahweh, and evil shall not be found in you all your

---

[1] I Sam. 26: 9.

[2] II Sam. 4: 8-12.

[3] I Ki. 2: 46

[4] II Sam. 5: 1-3.

[5] VI.

[6] V 2.

days."[1]

The Judean David is a Yahwist from the beginning. J introduces him to his readers on the occasion of his coming to Saul as Court Musician, in these glowing terms: "Skillful in playing and a man of unusual power, a warrior, judicious in speech, a distinguished looking man and Yahweh is with him."[2] The secret of David's greatness is similar to that of his predecessors in the theophanic line. From this first emergence into public life, Yahweh's training of David was continuous until its final consummation in his anointing. For J, there was no need of a theophany in which Yahweh should issue a special call to David as in the case of Moses and the judges. All of the events of the reign of Saul were leading to this grand climax.

The deliverers before David's time served their day and generation. Each new crisis brought forth its man of the hour called forth by Yahweh. With David and his line the succession reached its climax and permanency.[3] For the first time after the entry into Canaan, the tribes were all brought under one head. This was the realization of Yahweh's oft-repeated promise to the patriarchs and to Moses, namely, that of a land and a nation. J's passion for unity finds its complete satisfaction in this event.

With this examination of typical passages from J's treatment of history we shall try to formulate his philosophy of history and the social provenance that underlay it. The great importance for J of the establishment of the Kingdom of David grows out of his conception of Yahweh's method of dealing with his people. Yahweh has chosen Israel to be his very own. Likewise, he has

---

[1] I Sam. 25: 28. Cf. II Sam. 6: 21-23, David's reply to Michal's reprimand: "Blessed is Yahweh who chose me rather than your father and rather than any of his house to appoint me a leader over the people of Yahweh, over Israel. . . . ." Cf. The "Bundle of Life" passage, I Sam. 25: 29-31. This clearly indicates J's view of David's divine character.

[2] I Sam. 16: 18.

[3] This view of J's "theophanic" line of temporary leaders which culminated in the permanent house of David was suggested by Dr. W. C. Graham. He has developed the idea in an unpublished manuscript to which the writer was given access.

chosen the medium of relationship between the two parties of the covenant. J thus represents it as closed system. For an Israelite to be outside the sway of this divinely appointed medium of grace is to be outside Yahweh's care. Consequently, for J, the greatest apostasy was to reject the jurisdiction of the Davidic dynasty. In this, J cannot be accused of a narrow patriotic interest in his fellow Judean David. The system he visualizes is an inclusive one. All of the Hebrews come within the scope of his interest. The union of all the tribes under one head, to him the most profoundly significant event in Hebrew history, J, in a sense, universalizes. It was the act of a God who had created the world. He had chosen a people for himself and had selected leaders from time to time in the course of their history constantly looking toward this event. The establishment of the monarchy with its Davidic head, was for J the grand realization of that unity of his people, which he had idealized in his conception of one racial ancestor.

The king, for J, was both religious and secular head of the state. In addition to fighting the wars of Yahweh[1] David was priest, exercising full religious functions.[2] The basic interests of the people were thus brought under one head, the messianic King who was Yahweh's envoy.[3] J's sympathy for political institutions and his confidence in secular power thus grow out of his philosophy of history and his conception of divine-human relationships both of which are intimately related. In this it may be said that J puts his emphasis on the institution rather than on the individual occupant of the throne. J is primarily interested in order and stability; consequently he places his confidence in a system that he thinks will bring the largest satisfactions to

---

[1] Ancient warfare was, of course, a religious function.

[2] II Sam. 6: 17, 18.

[3] The sacredness of the office of messianic king of the Davidic line is further seen in the difference of attitude toward the person of the king in the North and South. There were numerous regicides in the North but none in Judah. The exception is Athaliah a Northerner who sought to destroy the heirs to the throne. The pattern established by David, who refused to take the life of any of Yahweh's anointed, prevailed in Judah. The act of Athaliah was utterly abhorrent to the people of the Southern Kingdom.

the nation as a whole. In J's time the monarchy had not proved its inadequacy as was true of it in the later age. His interest in the individual occupant of the throne lies in the contribution he can make to that end.

J is not given to idealizing his characters, however. For example, he does not seek to cover up the prevarication of Abraham or the conniving of Jacob.[1] This realistic presentation of human weakness as well as strength gives to J's style the simplicity and vigor we so much admire. He allows to stand Nathan's criticism of his greatest hero David for his treatment of Uriah.[2]

J's attitude toward the cultus is in harmony with his sympathy for the monarchy. He mentions the local shrines without criticism.[3] Abraham built altars at Shechem, Bethel and Hebron.[4] Isaac built an altar at Beersheba.[5] His friendliness to the local shrines and their worship receives further confirmation by his inclusion of popular etymologies of shrine names in his narrative.[6] J alludes also to sacred trees.[7]

J accepted sacrifice as a proper and legitimate method by which the worshiper could approach the deity and win his favor. On the occasion of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, David is said to have "offered whole burnt-offerings and thank-offerings before Yahweh."[8] On several occasions J mentions the miraculous consuming of food offerings as Yahweh's means of authenticating himself to his doubting votaries.[9]

---

[1] This is as we should expect in J, inasmuch as he has not benefited by the prophetic elevation of moral standards.

[2] II Sam. 11, 12. This may, however, be a late prophetic passage. If included by J, it may indicate that already J saw danger signs on the political horizon.

[3] S. R. Driver, Introduction to Literature of Old Testament (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1903), pp. 117-120.

[4] Gen. 12: 7, 8; 13: 4, 18. [5] Gen. 26: 25.

[6] Gen. 16: 14; 28: 19; 32: 30; 33: 17; 50: 11.

[7] Gen. 12: 6; 18: 1; 21: 33; Jg. 6: 11, 19.

[8] II Sam. 6: 18.

[9] Jg. 6: 19-25; 13: 19-25.

The J decalogue is a purely ritualistic code.[1] It includes several prohibitions, but accepts the cultic system without criticism. The Hebrews are forbidden to make "any molten god for themselves."[2] Several provisions appear to be of very great antiquity, namely, the prohibition of offering blood with unleavened bread, of leaving any of the passover festival over until the following morning,[3] and the prohibition of boiling a kid in its mother's milk.[4] In addition to its ancient character, the Yahwization of the code indicates the Canaanitic-Elohistic origin of the so-called J decalogue. J's was a government by the institution of the monarchy which was practically a law unto itself. There was no place in the full-fledged Messianic system for the elaborate legal codes that later developed.

J's attitude toward the cultus is typically pre-prophetic. There is no basis for Driver's view that the prophetical viewpoint is "brought forward prominently in J."[5] J's faith in the dominant system with its messianic head is practically unbounded. Events had not yet transpired in his time to shake that faith. This does not mean that he was so naïve that he did not sense certain dangers in the wholesale adoption of Canaanitic cultic practices. He warns that Yahweh is a jealous God and in the cultural fusion between the Hebrews and Canaanites, the Hebrews are in danger of dividing their loyalty between Yahweh and other gods.[6]

However, an incipient prophetic trend may be observed at certain points in J. For example, the story of Cain and Abel may be cited. Yahweh's rejection of Cain's agricultural offering is held to be a protest on the part of J against the Canaanitic fertility rites. But J's wholehearted acceptance of Messianic kingship meant that the dominant pattern of culture met with his complete approval.

Critics have made much of J's alleged Judean bias. It has always been a prominent element in the motivation offered for his history. It is true that Judah is given a place of prominence wherever possible. For example, he has Judah in the van when the

---

[1]Exodus 34. [2]V 17. [3]V 25. [4]V 26.

[5]Driver, op. cit., p. 118.

[6]Ex. 34: 11-16.

conquest is undertaken.[1] As we have seen, the Judean David occupies the place of central importance in J's scheme of Hebrew history. But J is fair to Northerners. To be sure, he has to use them in his succession of Yahweh-called leaders for lack of Judeans before David's time. He does this by making them full-fledged Yahwists, but at no point does he detract from their heroism. The legendary figures of the Patriarchal Age early became the property of both South and North, and so no one could be Yahwized with more ease than these early heroes.

At other points, J gives Judah a place of prominence; for example in the Joseph stories[2] and in the Blessing of Jacob.[3] Critical treatises usually point out the prevalence of Judean place names in J. Several of these may be mentioned. For example, Abraham's principal residence is at Hebron, later the great Judaic sanctuary,[4] Isaac's home is in or near Beer-Sheba,[5] and Jacob's original home is Beer-Sheba.[6] The evidences strongly point in the direction of Southern origins for J, it is true. But the social motivation to be found in this Southern interest is another matter. While J may have a preference for the South, which largely grows out of his theory of the relationship of the Southern deity Yahweh with the Hebrew people as a whole through the Davidic house, nevertheless, his interest in the North does not lag. His inclusion of Northern hero stories (Judges) naturally brings him in contact with Northern places. A few references to Northern sites are found in J's patriarchal section, for example, references to the sites of Bethel[7] and Shechem.[8]

---

[1] Jg. 1: 2. In this he is probably correct. Our latest reconstruction of Hebrew history indicates that Judah was among the earliest of the tribes to enter Canaan. Cf. Genesis 38.

[2] Gen. 37: 21, 26; 38: 21, 24.

[3] Genesis 49.

[4] Gen. 13: 18; 18: 1.

[5] Gen. 25: 11; 26: 6, 23-25, 33.

[6] Gen. 25: 11b; 28: 10.

[7] Gen. 28: 19; 35: 14-15.

[8] Gen. 12: 6. Cf. Driver, op. cit., p. 117. Cf. Oesterley and Robinson, Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934), pp. 30-32.

J's concern for Northern peoples is further shown by his tactful yet sharp criticism for their apostasy from Yahweh.[1] His sympathetic interest in the North is shown in his treatment of the Gideon story. An element in Gideon's greatness was the heroic stand he took against his fellow Manassites and their Baal worship.[2] Gideon gave implicit obedience to the command of Yahweh to tear down the altar of baal and cut down the Asherah. His fellow townsmen threatened Gideon with death but his father Joash, apparently a former Yahwist, arose to his son's defense with these words: "Will you take Baal's part, or will you champion him? . . . . If he is a god, let him take his own part; for his altar has been torn down."[3] Although the last part of the passage is apparently given as a basis for the interpretation of the name Jerubbaal, J intends also to convey to his Northern readers the implication of Baal's complete impotence. J thus manipulates this ancient story to impress upon the people of the North the importance of complete fidelity to the national deity, Yahweh.

J's Yahwization of all these Northern stories carries an implied criticism of their Baalism. They have been mistaken, J argues by implication, in their belief that the Baal, under the divine name Elohim, has been responsible for their achievements. Yahweh really has been the Elohim (or the God) who has directed Israel throughout her history, both North and South alike.[4] The patriarchs were thoroughly good Yahwists. Even the father of one of their greatest heroes, namely, Gideon, was a faithful Yahwist. J's implication is this: "What possible excuse can there now be for faithlessness to a God who has proved his power from time immemorial?" This of course assumes greater importance in J's mind because of his view of the divine character of the Davidic house established as a permanent instrument for Yahweh's dealings with his chosen people.

With J's characteristics before us, there remains to be

---

[1] J's representation of Northerners as falling away from Yahwism may be merely a strategy to show that their present lack of faithfulness was all the more serious inasmuch as they had once known the true way.

[2] Jg. 6: 25-32.

[3] V 31.

[4] For J, in theory at least, there was no North or South.

determined his social provenance. The psychology of J is definitely against the older critical view that he wrote in a period of national prosperity. A sense of crisis is imminent in J. There are phases of Hebrew life that J thinks are definitely wrong and which he wishes to correct. The functional character of the Judean history is too clearly manifest everywhere to suppose that J merely wrote to glorify his own tribe for its part in the success of the Hebrew people. Such glory would have to rest on the exalted position of Judah during the age of David and Solomon. There was very little in the history of Judah between the disruption and the probable date of J's appearance in which a loyal Judean could take pride. If J glorifies the Age of David and Solomon, it is because that glory has departed and he desires a renewal of the conditions that will bring a return to that happy state of affairs for both the South and the North.

We have seen that the great ideal of J is a unified Hebrew people. The implication is plainly that the Israelites were disunited when J wrote. It follows that J must have lived well after the disruption of the kingdom, long enough for him to view in perspective the events both before and after that event and to interpret them in relation to it. For J, the disruption was the great apostasy. The troubles of the Hebrew people as a whole are traceable to that colossal mistake.

J's Judean bias must be considered in determining his social situation. Here again, the evidence points to a time when the fortunes of the Southern kingdom were at extremely low ebb. Moreover, there was hardly a time between the disruption and the first writing prophets that could be called a time of prosperity for Judah. During the age of David and Solomon, Judeans were probably too busy enjoying their good fortune to write about it. The story of the past was most apt to be told when present problems were pressing for solution. Clearly, then, one of J's motivations was his desire to bring hope to his despairing fellow Judeans in a period of national decline.

Let us review the history of Judah following the disruption in the effort to find the situation that fits the conditions. Following the breakup there was continuous warfare for a time between North and South. The first three kings of Judah, Rehoboam, Abijah and Asa, engaged in hostilities with Jereboam and Baasha of Israel. In these encounters Judah came off second best. Baasha even suc-

ceeded in invading Judah and fortifying Ramah, an outpost near Jerusalem.

Following this early internecine struggle, the rise of the strong Omri dynasty in the North brought an interlude in hostilities, but the condition of Judah was improved but slightly. While an alliance existed between the two kingdoms, Israel practically held a suzerainty of Judah. Merely at the request of Ahab, Jehoshaphat hastened to his aid in his effort to recover Ramoth-Gilead from the Aramaeans.[1] Later, Jehoshaphat joined with Jehoram in his struggle with the Moabites.[2] There was nothing in all this to bring inspiration to the spirit of a proud Judean. But matters were to become still worse. The semblance of alliance may have provided a basis for the hope of a reunion of North and South. The alliance, if so it could be called, was further cemented by the marriage of Jehoram, king of Judah, son of Jehoshaphat, and Athaliah the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. But this must have been an unholy alliance from J's point of view, as later events proved to him. Following the slaying of King Ahaziah by Jehu, his mother Athaliah "arose and destroyed all the royal family."[3] Only Joash, the young son of Ahaziah, was hidden away; it looked as though the Davidic line was to become extinct. The Baalist Athaliah was now on the throne of David.

This is the situation that prevails about 840. We would suggest that this milieu provides the motivations for J's history. Only a recalling of Judah's past glory and a reminder of her hope for the future would be the tonic required to instill hope and courage in Judah during these dark days. What must have been the distress in Judah at the prospect of seeing her own Yahwist dynasty brought to such an ignominious end by the Baalist usurper Athaliah! This feeling would be greatly augmented by the fact that Jehu had only recently restored Yahwism as the official religion at Samaria. It would seem that nothing could prevent the transfer of the sceptre from Jerusalem to Samaria. Gross insult had been added to injury. It was not enough that Israel should deny Yahweh's jurisdiction and enter upon an independent course both politically and religiously. Judah could stand with great

---

[1] I Ki. 22: 1-23. [2] II Ki. 3: 7-12. [3] II Ki. 11: 1-3.

difficulty of course, being cut off from her fellow Hebrews, isolated and reduced to small proportions. But now the Northern Baalists through Athaliah were directly responsible for this threat at Judah's most cherished possession, her divinely appointed instrument of government and medium of Yahweh's blessing, the Davidic dynasty. It was a double threat. Yahweh's prerogatives, established in a ruling line which had been promised from time immemorial, were now to be stolen by the upstart Jehu dynasty. What is more likely than that the priest Jehoiada,[1] or some like figure close to the Jerusalem court, should write the J history in an effort to cope with the distressing conditions. The alarm at such a dire situation is here suggested as J's immediate social motivation.

J was a thoroughgoing Judean, but he could hardly be accused of narrow partizanship. He had a real interest in Northern people and longed for Hebrew unity but that unity could come through but one instrument, the Davidic dynasty, and that was a Judean possession.[2] It would be unfair to accuse J of theological predilections in his insistence on the significance of the Davidic dynasty. With him it was a practical consideration. The course of events had shown him the great folly of the Northern apostasy from Yahweh. J fervently believed that the future of the Hebrew people lay in facing that future with a united front under the government of a divinely chosen royal family.[3]

---

[1]The suggestion has similarly been made that the priest Abiathar may have been the writer of David's memoirs, II Sam. 9-20. Cf. A. T. Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1931), pp. 336-337.

[2]J's attitude is comparable to that of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to the unity of Christendom. It is highly desirable to the Roman Church but can only be effected under the banner of Rome.

[3]The suggestion of the time of Athaliah as the social milieu of J was made by Dr. W. C. Graham.

29

30 Blank

CHAPTER III

THE THEOCRATIC STRAND

We shall begin our study of the theocratic strand, as in the study of J, with the judges stories. Here, the stratification is more easily detected. On the basis of the criteria thus established for the theocratic material, it is hoped that we can determine the nature of the whole strand.

It was observed in our study of the story of Gideon[1] that later passages have been added to the J narrative. These are: Jg. 6: 7-10; 7: 2-8, 16-23; 8: 4-28.

Judges 6: 7-10 is clearly an addition to the J story of Gideon which begins at v 11, inserted here as an introductory note for the purpose of explaining the Hebrew defection that led to Midianite oppression and the subsequent events. The means of communication between Yahweh and his people, as represented by this writer is significant. Yahweh, or his angel, does not speak face to face with his people as in J. The method of communication is explained in the following words: "When the Israelites cried to the Lord on account of Midian, Yahweh sent a prophet to the Israelites, who said to them . . . . "[2] It will be observed that the author visualizes a more transcendent God than does J. The deity is so far removed from the human scene that a medium of communication is necessary. That medium is a prophet. In contrast to J's theological naïveté, here one at once gets the impression that the writer is far more advanced in his theological thinking. In the quotation from the prophet who transmits to the Israelites the actual words of Yahweh,[3] an explanation is offered for the cause of the distress that has come upon the Israelites and, by implication, a remedy is suggested. The Israelites have adopted the religious practices of the Canaanites[4] contrary to

---

[1]Jg. 6: 1-8: 28. [2]Jg. 6: 7, 8. [3]Jg. 6: 8-10.

[4]The theocratic writer employs the word Amorites in his references to the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Canaan. This is one of the distinguishing literary characteristics of the entire strand. Cf. Jg. 6: 10.

Yahweh's injunction not to do so. The result was that the divine discipline was administered through the instrumentality of the marauding Midianites. The remedy for the situation is implied in this explanation of the cause. A return to the pure worship of Yahweh by eliminating all Canaanitic elements would constitute the basis for the better day. That Yahweh is able to care for his own when they give him their undivided loyalty, the writer has not the slightest doubt. Was it not he who brought the Israelites safely out of Egyptian bondage?[1] Did he not give them possession of the land of Canaan?[2] The author everywhere heightens the miraculous element in Hebrew history. The human factor is very minor. "I it was," says Yahweh, "who did these things."[3] The function of the human individual in his theocratic capacity is that of a channel for the flow of the divine wisdom and power. Obviously, we are in a different theological atmosphere from that which dominates the section beginning at v 11 (J) where the angel of Yahweh came and sat down to talk with Gideon.[4] Judges 7: 2-8 and 16-23 are theocratic sections setting forth the theocratic writer's conception of how Gideon won his victory over the Midianites. Ordinarily, we think of military strength as residing in well disciplined and equipped numbers, but not so the theocrat. Yahweh informs Gideon that his army is too large. By the test of the way the soldiers drank water, Gideon's army of twenty-two thousand men was reduced to three hundred.[5] These three hundred were equipped with trumpets and pitchers, which were utterly worthless for military purposes. But the author has a clear purpose in mind in thus reducing the importance of the human factor. He expresses it in these words: "lest Israel should glory over me, saying, 'My own power has saved me.'"[6] Jahweh does it for Israel, not Israel for herself.

---

[1] Jg. 6: 9. [2] Jg. 6: 9b.

[3] Cf. JE "book" of Joshua where this idea dominates the theocratic treatment of this phase of the history.

[4] Cf. Gen. 3: 8, "Yahweh Elohim walked in the garden . . . ." Genesis 18: If, Yahweh visited Abraham's tent and dined with him. These are J passages.

[5] Jg. 7: 6, 7. [6] Jg. 7: 2.

This conception of the divine control of Israelite affairs is more than a mere theological preconception with the theocratic writer. It grows out of a deep seated conviction with him concerning the cause of the troubles of his people as he derives that cause from observation of the trends of his own time.

The present passage also gives us an insight into the writer's social theory. The significant individual is more important to him than the untutored masses. Hebrew victory will come through the small homogeneous cultural group. This cultural element is shown by the nature of the test given. Those who knelt down and drank greedily were discarded. Those who lapped daintily were retained.[1] The three hundred men thus selected were equipped with the trumpets and pitchers, and torches inside their pitchers. Divided into three companies, they followed Gideon into the fray and when the cue was given, they blew their trumpets, broke their pitchers and held the torches aloft in their left hands. This demonstration, followed by the cry, "For Yahweh and for Gideon," completely discomfited the Midianites. "Yahweh set them to fighting with one another all through the camp" we are told.[2] Victory was a simple matter after that.[3]

Briefly, it may be said the writer's emphases in this section are cultural and theological. One may detect a note of distrust of so-called secular institutions. He despairs of the value of great armies to bring success to a people.

Judges 8: 4-28 concludes the theocratic contribution to the Gideon story.[4] With the Midianite chieftains Oreb and Zeeb

---

[1]One may be justified in seeing in this, the influence of eighth century prophetism which denounced greed as one of the great social evils of the age. Cf. Isa. 5: 8; Am. 2: 6-8.

[2]Jg. 7: 22.

[3]The section, vv 16-23, fits in rather badly with what follows. One would conclude from the passage that the encounter was over, but in 7: 24f, J's story of the actual struggle begins.

[4]The usual interpretation of the stratum here designated "theocratic" is that it is a separate independent source combined with the more original source by an editor. Cf. George Foote Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1910), pp. 173f.

slain,[1] and the Ephraimites pacified over their snubbing at the hands of Manasseh,[2] the narrative would seem to be properly concluded. But the theocratic writer is not satisfied to end it thus. It is not enough that the military leaders of the Midianites be put out of the way. He goes further and has their kings, Zebah and Zalmunna suffer a like fate. The writer has to renew the battle, however, to make this representation. In the earlier battle, the main body of the Midianites, one hundred and twenty thousand men, had fallen. In the closing struggle, the remaining fifteen thousand men perished. The theocratic writer, then, set the Midianite military strength at one hundred thirty five thousand swordsmen. This is obviously a gross exaggeration. Predatory bands were never large; not more than several hundred men mounted on swift camels constituted a single band. The idea of one hundred thirty-five thousand men perishing at the hands of three hundred men without military equipment is utterly fantastic. But the idealism that underlies it is not fantastic. One man or a like minded group with an ideal can put to rout legions. One man with God is a majority. The importance of a distinctive culture implemented by a faith in an all-powerful deity is thus powerfully emphasized by the theocratic writer.

The author's distrust of secular power implied in 7: 2-8, is concretely set forth in the present section. The writer's resentment at the monarchy could hardly be expressed in more denunciatory terms than is contained in the statement by Gideon with reference to his treatment of the Midianite kings Zebah and Zalmunna. Says Gideon, "I will trample your bodies among desert thorns and briers."[3] The deepness of the theocrat's resentment is further shown by Gideon's treatment of the men of Succoth who had merely given aid to the ill-fated kings.

The climax of this theocratic discourse on the deserved fate of kings is reached in vv 22, 23. The Israelites offer the kingship to the hero of the story, Gideon.[5] But Gideon resolutely rejects the offer. The dominant motif of the entire theocratic

---

[1]Jg. 7: 25. [2]Jg. 8: 1-3. [3]Jg. 8: 7. [4]Jg. 8: 16.

[5]An hereditary monarchy is implied, v 22.

stratum here appears, "Yahweh rules over you."[1]

The character and function of Gideon in the theocratic stratum as contrasted with the picture of him we get from J is instructive. Gideon has practically no function to perform in the series of events just described, other than to serve as Yahweh's medium of communication. Strictly speaking, Gideon is not an envoy or messenger of Yahweh. Rather, he is the channel of the divine power, a typical theocrat. Yahweh himself does it all. He even supervises the testing of the soldiers in the selection of the army.[2] Yahweh personally defeated the Midianites by setting them to fighting among themselves.[3]

The theocratic sections cannot be construed as a continuous narrative or as originally belonging to an independent production before they found their way to their present position. Judges 6: 7-10 is the theocratic introduction of the JE story. It is reasonable to suppose that its literary history is similar to that of the later Deuteronomic introduction contained in 6: 1-6, namely, an editorial expansion. The theocratic sections 7: 2-8 and 7: 16-23, clearly belonging to the same source, were obviously injected into their present positions by a later editor. Judges 7: 1 fits well with 7: 9f. The narrative runs smoothly from 7: 15 to the account of the battle in the section beginning at 7: 23. The theocratic editor has cleverly made his additions at these points.[4] The only roughness is felt at 7: 22 to 7: 23f. Also, in making the expansion at 8: 4-28, the theocratic editor has failed to harmonize Gideon's position in 8: 4 with that in the J account as noted at 7: 25. But the latter discrepancy is no more serious at the hands of an editor who expanded the original narrative than of one who

---

[1]This hostility to the monarchy reaches its climax in the theocratic contribution to the story of the establishment of the monarchy, I Samuel. This will receive consideration at a later point.

[2]Jg. 7: 4.

[3]Jg. 7: 22. It will be observed, however, that Yahweh is not represented in anthropomorphic form.

[4]The theocratic editor uses the divine names Yahweh and Elohim interchangeably and synonymously. The significance of this will be discussed at a later point in our study.

may have united two independent sources. There is absolutely no evidence in the Gideon story for the existence of an editor of the latter type. Moreover, the theocratic sections when pieced together give no evidence of forming a continuous story of the events related. Some of the major elements of the story are omitted, for example, the account of the nature of the crisis and Gideon's tribal connections. From the theocratic strand, we would not know that the tribe of Manasseh was the sufferer from Midianite oppression.

The theocratic writer has slight interest in concrete details. He generalizes at every point: It was the Israelites not the Manassites who cried to Yahweh in the crisis;[1] the Israelites requested Gideon to rule over them.[2] The theocratic sections presuppose the Yahwistic material contiguous to them. In the Gideon story, therefore, the evidence points undeniably to the conclusion that the theocratic author has expanded the Yahwistic narrative. With these rather extensive additions, this editor has made the story useful for the needs of his own age.

It would seem that the editor found the story of Jephthah[3] useful for his purposes with very little addition. The Deuteronomic introduction is contained in the section beginning at 10: 6 and ending at 10: 10 or 10: 14. The removal of this Deuteronomic introduction leaves either vv 11-16 or 15-16 as the theocratic introduction to the JE story. The ideology and literary features favor the inclusion of vv 11-14 in the theocratic introduction.[4] This enables the editor to stress his usual theory of the cause of Israel's troubles. Religious defection is at the bottom of it all.[5] His bitter resentment at such apostasy is seen in his implications of the impotency of the gods to whom they have been giving allegiance, seen in the words put in the mouth of Yahweh: "Go and cry to the gods whom you have chosen! Let them save you in your time of distress!"[6] Their impotence is all the more

---

[1]Jg. 6: 8. [2]Jg. 8: 22. [3]Jg. 10: 6-12: 7.

[4]The word Amorites is again used. Reference to Yahweh's power in saving Israel in the Egyptian crisis and that of the conquest is frequent. Cf. Jg. 6: 9. The word used for "oppress" v 12, is frequently found in the theocratic stratum. Cf. Jg. 6: 9; I Sam. 10: 18.

[5]Jg. 10: 13. [6]Jg. 10: 14.

noticeable in contrast to the miraculous power of Yahweh in former crises of Israelite history.

When the cause of the trouble was removed, Yahweh was willing to listen to the pleading of the Israelites.[1] The events that follow transpire under his tutelage. Here again, the theocratic writer generalizes by extending an incident that concerned a single tribe to the whole of Israel.[2]

The theocratic editor is content to let the picture of Jephthah remain as it came from J's hands. J had made a full-fledged Yahwist of Jephthah. The pagan origin of the story and the nature of the events described precluded the possibility of making Jephthah into a thoroughgoing theocrat, however.[3]

The theocratic editor evidently found J's story of Samson useful for his purposes with but a single addition. Only one verse is traceable to his work, Jg. 13: 4. The idea expressed is typically theocratic. Yahweh himself was responsible for Samson's marriage to a Philistine woman, thereby laying the foundations for Samson's exploits among the Philistines and the opportunity for the display of his great strength and valor. Yahweh has complete control over the lives of those whom he selects as his special agents. It is the usual theocratic heightening of the miraculous.

Further theocratic material is found in the introduction to the JE "book" of Judges, 2: 6-9. The passage continues the theocratic "book" of Joshua which closes with Joshua's farewell address.[4] The theocratic writer thereby makes the connection between the two phases of the theme.

The theocratic writer begins his great contribution to the entire narrative with the story of Abraham.[5] Numerous additions

---

[1] Jg. 10: 16.

[2] Jg. 10: 11, 15, 16.

[3] That is a prophet with powers of intercession. Cf. Abraham, Gen. 20: 7, 17; Moses, Num. 11: 2. Jephah is included by the theocratic editor in his list of theocrats, however. Cf. I Sam. 12: 11.

[4] Cf. Jg. 2: 6, Josh. 24: 28. However, Jg. 2: 8, 9 repeat Josh. 24: 29, 30 and may indicate later editorial work.

[5] In the main, the analysis of the Hexateuch as accepted by the Wellhausen school will remain unchallenged as previously stated. Cf. E. S. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch (New York and Cincinnati, 1918).

to the Yahwistic Abraham Saga, are from his hand. The first theocratic material appears in Genesis 15. The J and E(theocratic) strands are so interwined here that analysis is difficult. The largest theocratic section at this point is vv 12b-15. Abraham (or Abram) receives a devine message while in a deep sleep (tardemah) during the course of which Yahweh reveals to Abraham that his descendants will undergo bondage in Egypt. But he promises that he himself will "bring judgment upon the nation that made slaves of them.[1] Four generations will elapse before the return to Canaan when the "guilt of the Amorites[2] is complete."[3] The theocratic writer does not mention the promise of a nation at this point as did J. His interest lies in stressing the power of God to save his people from their foes. The theocratic writer shows great hostility to Egypt,[4] not merely because they oppressed the Israelites but because they are a foreign people and constitute a cultural menace to Israel.[5]

The first large section of theocratic material in Genesis is the story of Abraham's experience with Abimelech.[6] The story is a doublet of the J passage dealing with a similar incident.[7] The same motif is employed, that of the husband endangered because of his beautiful wife. The setting is different, however. The theocratic writer places his story in Philistine territory, Gerar, whereas the J writer put his in Egypt. The theocratic story begins with the representation that Abimelech has already "sent and taken Sarah."[8] But God (Elohim) knowing what the outcome of the act of Abimelech would be warns the latter of his fate. The complete divine control of human affairs is everywhere evident. Yahweh held sway even over the life of Abimelech and prevented him from sinning against his servant Abraham. God's interest in Abimelech, however, only follows from his concern for Abraham whom he protects from all danger. God tells Abimelech that Abraham is

---

[1]Gen. 15: 14.

[2]Theocratic word, Cf. Jg. 6: 10.

[3]Gen. 15: 16. [4]Gen. 15: 14.

[5]It also grows out of the fact that the Hebrews often relied on Egypt in emergencies and as often she failed them.

[6]Gen. 20: 1-18. [7]Gen. 12: 10-20. [8]Gen. 20: 3.

a prophet who has power to intercede with the deity in his behalf.

The unpleasant features of the J story are eliminated from the theocratic version. The theocratic writer rationalizes Abraham's lie so that he was not guilty of prevarication after all. Sarah was Abraham's half-sister when he married her.[1] Abimelech did not wrong Sarah at all. God had seen to that by warning Abimelech beforehand. Abraham is not the disgraced husband here as in J, where he accepted gifts at the cost of his wife's mistreatment.[2] The pagan Abimelech showers gifts on the theocrat Abraham and his wife, but this is done to center attention on Abraham. "Abraham prayed to God, and God cured Abimelech. . . . ."[3] The great function of the theocrat is here shown to be that of medium or mediary between the divine and human. Here it was a human petition to God to which the deity immediately responded. The theocratic writer was not especially sympathetic toward Abimelech. His interest lay primarily in demonstrating his theocrat Abraham's intercessory function and God's power in granting his request.

The next large theocratic section and the last contribution of that writer to the Abraham story is the account of the proposed sacrifice of Isaac.[4] With depth of feeling and great restraint, the theocratic writer tells the story of this test which came to Abraham. God tells Abraham to take his only son Isaac to the land of Moriah and offer him on one of the hills which he would there designate to him.[5] To this command Abraham gave unquestioning obedience. Having arrived at the designated place, arrangements were made to carry out the sacrifice. Abraham's supreme trust in God is indicated in his reply to Isaac's question concerning the sheep for the burnt-offering.[6] "God will provide,"

---

[1] Gen. 20: 12.

[2] The prophetic influence on the theocratic writer is here in evidence. Abraham is a Nabi, a prophet. A higher morality is indicated in Abraham's truthfulness and the higher sexual morality than that found in J. The latter may also indicate the prophetic hostility to sacred prostitution as practiced at the local shrines.

[3] Gen. 20: 17.

[4] Gen. 22: 1-18.

[5] Gen. 22: 2.

[6] Gen. 22: 7, 8.

answered the theocrat. The outcome of the incident is well known. The divine voice called to Abraham: "Do not lay hands on the boy, do nothing of the sort to him; for I know that you revere God. . . . ."[1] This reveals the purpose for which the story is related. Secondarily, the theocratic writer is interested in registering condemnation of child sacrifice, a practice that was probably current in his day,[2] but primarily his purpose was to illustrate the quality of reliance on God that became the theocratic leader and his group of faithful followers. The victim was miraculously provided when Abraham's complete trust and obedience had been tested.

It is interesting to note the reward that is promised for such obedience. Abraham is to have numerous descendants. They are to have material possessions--the cities of their enemies.[3] But God does not promise to make a great nation of him as in J.[4] This is very significant as we shall see.

Let us observe the two pictures of Abraham we get from the J and theocratic strands. In J, Abraham is called to father a race that is ultimately to be constituted as a nation. It is definitely a secular task. Yahweh's part in the events is to call Abraham and to give him guidance and protection looking forward constantly to the goal for which purpose the racial experiment was begun. In the theocratic strand the emphasis is distinctly on the side of the religious. Instead of a Yahweh-called founder of a nation, as in J, Abraham is the prototype of the faithful group, the founder of a theocracy. In the former, the person and function of the leader is much more important than in the latter. That is, after Yahweh has assigned him his great task and promised him protection in crises, the responsibility for success rests on him. In the latter, he is merely the faithful medium. God will do it all, conditioned, of course, on the quality of loyalty and life of both the theocrat and his followers.

We have next to examine the theocratic contribution to J's story of Jacob.[5] The theocratic writer has made numerous brief

---

[1]Gen. 22: 12. [2]II Ki. 21: 6. [3]Gen. 22: 17.

[4]Cf. Gen. 12: 1, 2. [5]Gen. 25: 19-37: 1.

additions throughout the story but his contribution contains no complete independent traditions. Some of the representative sections will be considered.

When Jacob has grown up, his father Isaac charges him to return to the native land of the family, Paddan-Aram, to secure for himself a wife.[1] This is found in J and, of course, was an expression of J's interest in the purity and solidarity of the Hebrew racial stock. Enroute he spends the night at a certain sanctuary. Here, the theocratic writer injects the story of the dream in which Jacob saw a ladder reaching to heaven on which angels of God were ascending and descending.[2] In this imagery, God was represented as quite remote from human affairs, but communication was possible. But in J, Yahweh stood immediately over him when he made his usual promises.[3] In the theocratic strand Jacob is so awe-struck by the demonstration that a vow of faithfulness is elicited from him forthwith. For constant divine protection and sustenance, Jacob promises faithfulness to God manifested by his returning to him a portion of everything he has.[4]

The theocratic contribution to J's account of the birth of Jacob's twelve sons provides an additional insight into its author's point of view.[5] Rachel expresses to Jacob her great chagrin because of her childlessness, in a manner that places the blame on her husband. The theocrat Jacob sharply reprimanded the untutored Rachel with these words, "Can I take the place of God (Elohim), who has kept you from having children."[6] She should have known that such matters rest completely in God's hands. When Rachel next speaks she shows more insight. Having gotten a child by her maid Bilhah, Rachel observed, "God brought judgment upon me, but now he has heeded my cry and given me a son."[7] The same idea of divine omnipotence, and punishments and rewards on the

---

[1] Genesis 28.

[2] Gen. 28: 11-12.

[3] Gen. 28: 13-16.

[4] Gen. 28: 20-22.

[5] Genesis, Chap. 30.

[6] Gen. 30: 2. Cf. J's version of how Rachel's childlessness was overcome is entirely different. Cf. Gen. 30: 7-16. By a bargain with Leah, Rachel receives some of her son's mandrakes by which child-bearing is induced.

[7] Gen. 30: 6.

basis of faithfulness is seen in Leah's remark on the occasion of the birth of her fifth son, Issachar. She said, "God has given me my reward for giving my maid to my husband."[1]

The part played by God in Jacob's dealings with Laban has been interestingly portrayed in the theocratic strand.[2] Instead of a shrewd conniving barterer as in J, the proto-type of the small unscrupulous merchant, Jacob becomes the man of God, whose every step is divinely planned, a paragon of virtue. It was really God who outsmarted the wily Laban after all and not Jacob.

Jacob boasts of his own honesty.[3] The goats that bred speckled and spotted and the lambs that were black were to be Jacob's possession. If any not so marked came into his possession it was by theft, Jacob avers.[4] J did not hesitate to indicate Jacob's clever plan to induce the ewes to breed speckled and striped lambs.[5] This must have been distasteful to the theocratic writer. At any rate, the incident gave him an opportunity to express his own ideal and to correct the impression the J story was making on the minds of current readers. It was God who was responsible for Jacob's material success. He was constantly with Jacob and permitted Laban to do him no harm.[6] God actually took away most of Laban's flock and gave it to Jacob.[7] In order to confirm his point of view, the theocratic writer describes a dream in which it was all revealed to Jacob just how God manipulated the breeding to secure the results favorable to Jacob. It was a simple matter. God saw to it that the offspring were sired only by rams that were striped, speckled and mottled.[8] The whole point is, God did it.

The theocratic writer contributes a large section dealing with Jacob's departure from Laban.[9] As in the case of Abimelech,[10]

---

[1]Gen. 30: 18.

[2]Parts of Gen. 30: 32f. For the analysis see Brightman, op. cit.

[3]Gen. 30: 33. [4]Gen. 30: 33. [5]Gen. 30: 35-43.

[6]Gen. 31: 6, 8. [7]Gen. 31: 10. [8]Gen. 31: 10, 13.

[9]Gen. 31: 28-45.

[10]Cf. Gen. 20: 3. Both revelations came in a dream. God uses non-Hebrews to further the interests of his own people.

God appeared to Laban and warned him to do the theocrat Jacob no harm.[1] Jacob elaborates on the virtuous attitude he has taken in all his relations with Laban. Jacob, himself, bore all the losses sustained by thefts and raids by wild beasts.[2] He bore the brunt of constant hardship, heat by day, cold by night, and loss of sleep.[3] And yet all his efforts would have been unavailing had not God been on his side. One with God can outwit any enemy, is the lesson the writer seeks to impress on his contemporaries.

We shall mention two other theocratic passages in the Jacob cycle, Gen. 34: 15-18 and Gen. 35: 1-5. The former passage is found in connection with the story based evidently on an authentic incident, an altercation between the Canaanites of Shechem and the Hebrews. The trouble is represented as arising from the desire of Shechem the son of Hamor, to marry Dinah the daughter of Jacob. In J, the Hebrews steadfastly refuse to accede to Shechem's request on the ground that the Shechemites were uncircumcized.[4] In the theocratic strand the Shechemites request the privelege of intermarriage with the Hebrews in return for which the land and its privileges will be at the latter's disposal.[5] The theocratic writer represents the Hebrews as aquiescing, on condition that the Shechemites be circumcized like themselves. This would mean that these pagans were to become religiously and culturally homogeneous with the Hebrews, that is, to become a "single people.[6] The story indicates that J was interested primarily in a racially pure and homogeneous people as the basis of the nation. That is, the nation is uppermost in J's mind. He steadfastly held on therefore against amalgamation with these non-Hebrews. But the theocratic author was interested in a culturally distinct and homogeneous people, composing a theocratic society. Accordingly, he prescribes the conditions under which amalgamation could be effected, namely by the Shechemites practicing the rite which to him meant the adoption of the culture of the Hebrews.

---

[1]Gen. 31: 29. [2]Gen. 31: 39. [3]Gen. 31: 40.

[4]Gen. 34: 14. [5]Gen. 34: 8-10.

[6]Gen. 34: 15-18. Cf. Chicago Translation. The demand for circumcision is contained in both the J and E strands. In the latter it constitutes a bond of cultural unity in the former, of national solidarity.

In Gen. 35: 1-5 God bids Jacob go to Bethel to live and there to construct an altar to God. The theocratic writer evidently does not object to the local shrines, but he criticizes the syncretism that often accompanied their worship. He has Jacob command his household and all who were with him to, "Get rid of the foreign gods . . . . , purify yourselves. . . . ."[1] Religious purity is the great ideal. On this occasion, the people promptly heeded the theocrat's request and their religious paraphernalia, such as idols and earrings, were burned. God rewarded their obedience by so completely terrorizing the native peoples that the latter made no attempt to molest the Hebrews on their journey.

With this brief examination of representative theocratic additions to the Jacob saga, let us compare the pictures of Jacob given us by J and the theocratic writer. In J, Jacob is little more than a connecting link in the racial line begun by Abraham. To be sure, Yahweh appears to him in an occasional theophany giving him direction and renewing the promises made to Abraham, namely those of possession of the land and of nationhood. He is one of the members of the "theophanic" line leading toward this great goal. There is little cultural or religious refinement in J's picture of Jacob. His psychology, his strength and weaknesses of character are those of the typical oriental chieftain.

In the theocratic strand, however, Jacob becomes the prophetic type of character. His relationship with God is unbroken: His trust in God both for security and sustenance is undiminished. He takes care that the religion of his group is not contaminated by foreign intermixture. He continues the task that devolves upon the theocratic line beginning with Abraham, namely, that of developing the Hebrews into a culturally unique group.

When we come to the story of Joseph we find the usual theocratic additions.[2] The familiar dream motif appears in several sections. In contrast to the reason given by J for the brother's jealousy, the theocratic writer gives the substance of two dreams of Joseph.[3] In the first, he dreams that his brothers' sheaves

---

[1]Gen. 35: 2. Cf. I Sam. 7: 3.

[2]Gen. 37: 2-48: 22.

[3]Gen. 37: 5-11.

do obeisance to his sheaf, the symbolism indicating Joseph's later postion of dominance over his brothers. In the second, the same idea is conveyed by Joseph's vision of the sun, moon and stars doing homage to him. Both indicate God's omniscience--he knew what was to transpire from the very beginning.

The brothers of Joseph plotted his destruction and to accomplish their purpose, they threw him in a pit. But at the instigation of Judah, they drew him from the pit and sold him to Egypt.[1] The theocratic writer has a different version as one would expect; he increases the miraculous element by having a band of Midianites pass by just at the proper time, who lifted Joseph from the pit and carried him to Egypt.[2]

After Joseph had been cast into prison (J), by a series of dreams the theocratic writer represents Joseph as winning his freedom and the favor of the Pharaoh. Joseph's skill in interpreting the dreams of his fellow prisoners, the Pharaoh's butler and baker, brings him to the attention of the Pharaoh.[3] Joseph interpreted for him his dream which no one else in the realm could fathom. The symbolism of the dream--the seven lean cows and the seven blasted ears--indicated, of course, the approaching famine which in turn was the basis of the Hebrew sojourn in Egypt. The significant thing to be noticed in the theocratic strand at this point is the exalted place given the deity in the whole series of events. Joseph is made into a good theocrat throughout. He is merely the divine agency in the interpretation, for, says he, "apart from God can Pharaoh be given a favorable response?"[4] Even the dream itself constituted a divine revelation to Pharaoh of the calamity about to befall his nation.[5] God used non-Hebrews to further the fortunes of his own people.

The result of the favorable impression thus made on Pharaoh

---

[1]Cf. Gen. 37: 27, 28 (J). It will be noted that J has Judah, his own tribal ancestor, remark: "Come let us sell him . . . . . and not lay hands on him; for . . . . . he is our own brother, our own flesh. v 27. This carries out J's idea of Hebrew racial solidarity.

[2]Gen. 37: 28, a, c.

[3]Gen. 40: 6-15a; 41: 1-14a.

[4]Gen. 41: 16.

[5]Gen. 41: 25, 28, 32.

was Joseph's appointment as head of the entire realm. Pharaoh was the nominal ruler but Joseph actually was in control, a virtual dictator in the emergency.[1] At this point, we get an interesting insight into the ideas of the theocratic writer concerning his ideal type of ruler. When it was proposed to Pharaoh that men be specially appointed to collect and conserve the food supplies,[2] the theocratic writer puts in the mouth of the pagan Pharaoh these words: "Can we find a man with the spirit of God in him like this one?,"[3] and "Since God has made all this known to you, there is no one so shrewd and prudent as you; you shall be in charge. . . . ."[4] After proper ceremonies, Joseph is duly inducted into the office. The ideal ruler has the theocratic qualifications. He has the spirit of God which gives him shrewdness and prudence and makes of him a medium for the divine wisdom.

It is unnecessary to call attention to all the theocratic additions. In the majority of them, the writer heightens the miraculous elements as we would expect. Even the names of Joseph's children carry that import.[5] The brothers on finding the money replaced in their sacks, are represented as trying to account for the strange incident by attributing it to God.[6] Even Joseph's house-steward offers a similar explanation to the brothers in their discomfort over the incident.[7]

The theocratic speech put in the mouth of Joseph when his identity finally becomes known to his brothers illustrates the writer's conception of divine providence.[8] It was God who was behind the act of Joseph's brothers in selling him into Egypt. He foreknew that the famine was to come and thus prepared for it, that a remnant of his people might be preserved in the earth. The whole chain of events was completely under the divine control. Joseph was merely the divine agent.[9]

---

[1] Gen 41: 44. This relationship between Joseph and Pharaoh affords the theocratic writer an opportunity to show the superiority of the theocrat over the secular ruler.

[2] Gen. 41: 34-36 (J).

[3] Gen. 41: 38 (E).

[4] Gen. 41: 39. Cf. 42: 18.

[5] Gen. 41: 51, 52.

[6] Gen. 42: 28.

[7] Gen. 43: 23.

[8] Gen. 45: 5b-9.

[9] Gen. 45: 7-10.

The vision[1] to Jacob at Beersheba while enroute to Egypt is instructive. After offering sacrifices the divine message came to Israel[2] (Jacob) in which God promised to accompany him to Egypt where he would make a great nation of him. It may be significant that the promise made here of becoming a nation is to be fulfilled in Egypt, ostensibly under the theocrat Moses, whereas in J the promise of nationhood is connected with possession of Canaan.[3] The theocratic writer is interested in the return to and possession of Canaan,[4] but the Hebrews are to be molded into a nation before they reach the promised land. The importance of this difference of viewpoint will appear in our study of the theocratic interpretation of Moses' work.

The theocratic writer concludes his contribution to the Joseph cycle of stories with a beautiful description of the complete reconciliation of Joseph and his brothers.[5] Joseph reassures them, that they should have no fear, and that what they have done has worked out to the mutual benefit of all. God accounted their act good inasmuch as it fitted perfectly into his plan. In this chain of events, the theocratic writer is proclaiming that "God made even the wrath of man to praise him." Joseph's reminder, "Can I take God's place,"[6] expresses by implication the true function of the theocrat. God is responsible for the conduct of the affairs of his people, not his theocratic representatives. The theocrat is merely God's human hand, so to speak, making effective God's purposes among men. His great responsibility rests in his faithfulness to that task. With the end approaching, Joseph speaks a last word of comfort to his brothers, "I am about to die, God will be sure to take note of you."[7] The implication is that another theocratic leader will be chosen through whom God can minister to the needs of his people.

The theocratic writer makes one of his largest expansions in connection with Moses. Perhaps that fact may be taken as in-

---

[1]The typical theocratic medium of divine revelation.

[2]The theocratic writer uses the name Israel instead of Jacob for the third Patriarch.

[3]Gen. 12: 1, 2.

[4]Cf. Gen. 50: 20.

[5]Gen. 50: 15-26.

[6]Gen. 50: 20.

[7]Gen. 50: 24

dicating the importance he attaches to the work of Moses. In J, Moses is introduced to the reader as an adult.[1] The theocratic writer, however, injects the story of the miraculous circumstances surrounding his infancy.[2] The story is well known and requires no elaboration here. That his life was so marvelously preserved further indicates for the theocrat the importance he assumed in the divine plan.

The theocratic writer expands J's story of Moses' call.[3] He dislikes the anthropomorphic character of the incident and tones it down by adding the note: "Then Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God."[4] God speaks to Moses directly when he calls him to his great task of liberating his fellow Hebrews.[5] We are not told that the divine communication was mediated through a dream or otherwise. Elsewhere, the theocratic writer states that God spoke face to face to Moses.[6] This may be taken as another indication of the supreme importance of the work of Moses, at least in the opinion of the theocratic writer. In most cases the divine message is mediated by dreams or visions. At the mention of his own incapacity for the task, God informs him that he himself will be with him. That for the theocrat is sufficient to guarantee success. The sign of authentication for Moses himself is that when the people have made their exit they shall serve God at this mountain where God will reveal to them his purposes more fully. We shall see later, the theocrat makes the events at Sinai the great moment in Hebrew history.

The theocratic writer has made numerous additions throughout the story of the exodus. His purposes are everywhere clear, namely, to enhance the miraculous character of the events and to exalt the office of the theocrat.

In assuming his task and after duly authenticating himself

---

[1]Ex. 2: 11-14.

[2]Ex. 2: 3-10. Cf. the story of Sargon's infancy.

[3]Ex. 3: 2-4a.

[4]Ex. 3: 6.

[5]Ex. 3: 9, 10. Here as elsewhere the theocratic writer never represents God in anthropomorphic terms.

[6]Num. 12: 8.

to the elders of Israel, Moses is bidden to proceed with the elders[1] to Pharaoh and appeal to Pharaoh for the privilege of making a three days journey into the desert to offer a sacrifice, a kind of ruse to make their escape without Egyptian interference.[2] The theocratic writer knows it will not be effected so easily.[3] He emphasizes the stubborness of Pharaoh, which reflects credit on a deity powerful enough to overcome such an obstacle. It will require great force to break down Pharaoh's resistance but that will be a simple matter for God. By simply stretching out his hand,[4] such plagues will be brought upon the Egyptians, that escape will be merely a matter of course. He will even go so far as to break down their ill will, to the extent that the Egyptians will shower presents on their departing hostages.[5]

In J, the position of Aaron is secondary to that of Moses.[6] In that strand, he is merely the spokesman for Moses because of the latter's lack of readiness of speech. But in the theocratic strand, he shares with Moses the task of liberation. This is doubtless a gesture to the North on the part of the theocrat to indicate to those peoples that they had adequate representation in these significant events.[7]

By brief additions throughout the story of the plagues, the theocratic writer continues to emphasize the importance of the miraculous in Hebrew history. Yahweh had complete control of the situation, even to the extent of "hardening Pharaoh's heart."[8] By

---

[1]Samuel also has the assistance of elders. I Sam. 8: 4. The theocratic writer dislikes autocracy in any form even in the person of the theocrat.

[2]Ex. 3: 18.

[3]In fact he does not want it to be accomplished so easily because in that case the power of God could not be demonstrated.

[4]This is purely a figurative expression in the theocratic strand and not an anthropomorphism.

[5]Ex. 3: 19-22.

[6]Ex. 4: 14-16.

[7]Ex. 4: 27-28; 5: 1-2. Cf. Ex. 4: 29-31. (J) Aaron is criticized, however, in the Golden Calf story. Cf. Exodus 32.

[8]Ex. 10: 20, 27. In J we are merely told that Pharaoh became stubborn, 8: 32 (J). Cf. 9: 35 (E or theo.) In the latter passage it was God who made Pharaoh stubborn.

increasing Pharaoh's obstinacy the feat of liberation was, of course, all the greater.

Whereas in J, the plagues are brought directly by Yahweh, in the theocratic strand the divine power that brings the catastrophes is mediated by the theocrat always with the staff in his hand.[1] In J, Moses is merely the spokesman or representative of the Israelites in their negotiations with Pharaoh. But in the theocratic stratum Moses is more than a representative of the people; through his mediatorial capacity the results are accomplished.[2]

Throughout the events of the Exodus, it is Yahweh who does it all. God (Elohim)[3] himself directed the course of their journey.[4] He even clogged the chariot wheels of the pursuing Egyptians, causing them to lose out in their race with the Hebrews and finally to be completely destroyed by the onrushing waters.[5] It was a complete triumph for Yahweh, the great event being celebrated in song by the prophetess Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.[6] It is interesting to note that the sister of Moses is also raised to prophetic stature in this later strand. The author has no objection to division of labor in the theocratic office. After all, the theocrat is a mere channel for God's grace. It is God himself who has the governing power.

The type of society the theocratic writer visualizes becomes clear in his contributions to J's narrative of the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai.[7] The great ideal of the theocracy which everywhere dominates his work minimizes the importance of the in-

---

[1] Ex. 7: 17b, 20b; 9:22-23a; 10: 12-13a. Cf. Ex. 10: 20-23, where Moses merely lifts his hands to bring about the plague of darkness.

[2] The work of Moses has a definite magical quality in the theocratic strand due more to the writer's anxiety to exalt the office than to lack of theological sophistication.

[3] Theocratic source freely interchanges the names Yahweh and Elohim.

[4] Ex. 13: 17-19. [5] Ex. 14: 25. [6] Ex. 15: 20-21.

[7] Ex. 15: 22--18: 27.

dividual in the actual affairs of human government. Rather than obedience to man-made ordinances and to the whims of kings and earthly rulers, God gives laws for the control of human affairs, to which he commands obedience. Before Sinai is reached the theocratic writer prepares for the great event there to be enacted. His conception of an ideal society is implied in his admonition to his fellow wanderers. The well being of the Hebrews will be guaranteed, he says, if they "will but heed the injunction of Yahweh and do what is right in his eyes, and pay attention to his commands, and observe all his statutes."[1] It is a government of divine law not of executive decision which he champions.

When the Hebrews have met the requirements of obedience they need have no fear of such disasters as those that overwhelmed the Egyptians, nor do they need to fear the enemy that would crush them. The first test came when Israel encountered the Rephidim. The victory was won for Israel not by human weapons but by the power of God mediated through Moses' outstretched arms.[2]

The theocratic writer constantly manifests his distrust of human government. He decentralizes the authority of Moses by delegating many of his duties to lesser individuals. Moses had personally judged all the disputes brought to him, the trivial ones along with those of greater importance. At the suggestion of his father-in-law Jethro, only the more important decisions are now to be rendered by Moses. A corps of helpers was to be selected to handle all minor matters.[3] It is important to note that Moses then was to act in the capacity of an advocate with God to bring cases to the deity.[4] The basis of his decisions was the statutes of God in which he gave the people constant instruction.[5] In the type of society here visualized, even the work of the theocrat is of relatively minor importance. It is a government under God who has given statutes and decisions for the guidance of the people in all their affairs.

But God had not yet provided those statutes. This was the great event at Sinai.[6] No sooner were the Hebrews encamped in the desert of Sinai than Moses went up to God,[7] where he was instructed

---

[1]Ex. 15: 26. [2]Ex. 16: 8-16. [3]Ex. 18: 1-27.

[4]Ex. 18: 19, 20. [5]Ex. 18: 16, 20. [6]Ex. 19: 1--40: 38.

[7]Ex. 19: 2b-3a.

by Yahweh to have the people prepare themselves for the great event by a period of consecration.[1] When all was ready, on the third day the divine manifestation began in thunder and lighting and a loud trumpet blast. The people were then brought to the foot of the mountain to meet God.[2] As the blast of the trumpet grew louder, Moses spoke and God answered him with a thunder peal.[3] Then God spoke the ten words (E Decalogue).[4] Following this, the people were overcome by great fear. Moses quieted them with the explanation that it was only to test them that God had come.[5] With the people remaining at a distance, Moses drew nearer to God who was now enveloped in dense darkness.[6] Following this, Yahweh communicated to him directly the contents of the Covenant Code.[7]

The Decalogue and Covenant Code[8] provide for the twelve Hebrew tribes a complete legal system for the regulation of their moral and religious lives as well as their secular interests. This for the theocrat was the climax to which the continuous divine revelation through the theocratic line was leading. Moses is interested in having the people fully understand the significance of the law thus revealed. Accordingly, he repeated all the "regulations and ordinances" to the people.[9] They met with the unanimous approval of the people who heartily pledged their obedience: "All the regulations that Yahweh has given we will observe."[10] Moses reduced the law thus given to writing and on the following day the divine-human covenant was made. After an altar was constructed with twelve pillars, symbolic of the unity of the twelve tribes about to enter the covenant, sacrifices were offered. Thereupon

---

[1]Ex. 19: 10-11a. [2]Ex. 19: 14-17. [3]Ex. 19: 19.

[4]Ex. 20: 1-17. [5]Ex. 19: 20.

[6]The theocratic writer here refrains from anthropomorphic representations of the deity. He merely says that the divine voice speaks, but the deity is enshrouded in a cloud and darkness.

[7]Ex. 20: 22--23: 33.

[8]Contrast this with the meager legislation of J.

[9]Ex. 24: 3. [10]Ex. 24: 3.

Moses read to the people the book of the covenant, the contents of which he had repeated to them earlier. Again the people pledge their obedience. With that, Moses took the blood of the sacrifice and dashed it on the people saying, "That is the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you on the basis of all these regulations."[1] This was the fulfillment of God's promise to Jacob when he bade him go down to Egypt saying, "there I will make you a great nation."[2] Complete divine control of Hebrew affairs had brought about this accomplishment. Here were the twelve tribes perfectly united in a theocracy with a divinely given set of laws to regulate every phase of their lives. In J, as we saw, the covenant at Sinai was merely preparatory for the enactment of the Davidic covenant in Palestine.

It remained only to go on to occupancy of the land God had promised to them. But that occasioned no difficulty for the Hebrews since they had at their behest a divine power able to surmount all obstacles. In fact, it was to God's interest as much as their own that his covenant people be prosperous and contented in the land he had given them. It is his task, therefore, to see them safely in possession of that land.

A comparison of the pictures of Moses we get from J and E (theocratic) reveals a similarly interesting contrast, as observed in the case of the patriarchs. In J, Moses is merely a deliverer in a crisis, similar to Joseph, Gideon and others. Yahweh's covenant with him is only a renewal of the promise made to the patriarchs, the promise that he would make of the Hebrews a nation when he had given them possession of Canaan. He is a secular leader who was called to his task by the divine energizing imparted to him in the theophany of the burning bush. He is but one of the

---

[1] Ex. 24: 8. Some scholars believe that the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20: 22--23: 33 originally stood in Joshua 24. The opinion is that the lawgiving and the entrance into the covenant relationship belong to Shechem, the home of the Baal-berith or El-berith. In that case Gerezim and not Sinai was the mountain of the law. Shechem was an early political center. Cf. I Ki. 12: 1f. See D. D. Luckenbill, "On Israel's Origins," A. J. T. XXII (1918), 24-53; T. J. Meek, "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," A. J. S. L. XXXVII (1920-21), 101ff. The theocrat has probably moved this set of events and the law itself from another location to its present one to connect them with Moses and the formation of the theocracy.

[2] Gen. 46: 3, 4.

theophanic line leading up to David and the promised establishment of the nation. But in the theocratic strand, Moses[1] becomes the agent of God for the establishment of the theocratic nation. The miraculous character of Moses' whole career attests the part God played in the events and the importance the author attached to those events. Not that the theocrat himself was so important in the divine government. In the theocratic system, an individual is exalted above that of his fellows only so far as he qualifies as a medium of the divine revelation. The important factors are the two members of the covenant relationship, God himself, and the Hebrew people, and the legal system which he has given for the regulation of their lives.

The theocratic writer relates the story of the last incident that happened at Sinai, that of the Golden Calf.[2] Such disloyalty was too much for the theocrat. He represents the wrath of Yahweh as so intense that he threatened the very destruction of the people.[3]

Further decentralization of Moses' official duties was accomplished in the course of the desert journey. At the command of Yahweh, seventy elders were appointed. Yahweh prepared them for their task, as the theocratic writer explains it, by withdrawing some of the spirit which he had deposited on Moses and transferring it to the elders.[4]

And yet Moses has the place of supremacy. He enjoyed the privilege of speaking to Yahweh face to face, a privilege granted to no other theocrat as we have seen.[5] Miriam and Aaron sought to

---

[1]Moses was the greatest of the theocrats, God's greatest prophet. The evidence is the way in which God had communicated with him, the character of his mediation, that is, "face to face." Cf. Dt. 33: 10. Moses could not thus have been raised to prophetic stature until the prophetic movement was strong enough to make its influence felt.

[2]Ex. 32: 1-35. The significance of the event from the theocratic point of view will be discussed in a later connection.

[3]Ex. 33: 3, 5. Continued disloyalty of the people resulted in the punishment of rejection from the promised land.

[4]Num. 10: 16-17.

[5]Num. 12: 8.

share Moses' prerogatives. Yahweh became so angry that he turned Miriam leprous and her cure was effected only at the earnest pleading of Moses.[1]

Yahweh was further angered by the grumbling and disloyalty of the Hebrews in the desert experience, so much so that he refused permission to the adults to enter the promised land, with the exception of the faithful Caleb and Joshua. All over twenty years of age were condemned to perish in the desert.[2] Here we have represented the most important aspect from the people's point of view in the theocratic conception of an ideal society. Absolute trust and obedience were essential. The story of Dathan and Abiram further illustrate this point by indicating the fate of those who disobey. These unfortunates complained against Moses for bringing them to a desert where their condition was worse than the former one in Egypt. Moses pleads that he himself has always been fair with them and that Yahweh has been faithful.[3] As a result of this disloyalty their offerings are to be rejected. The result was the destruction of Dathan and Abiram and their families and possessions.[4] By thus manipulating the stories of the ancient past, the theocrat seeks to remove every excuse for disloyalty to the exclusive religious culture of his own age.

Several important theocratic additions to the J narrative of the later desert experience remain to be mentioned. At one stage, the people complain so bitterly against God and Moses because of their wretched condition, that Yahweh sent serpents among them that fatally stung them. They plead their sinfulness and ask Moses' intercession for them. Moses acceded to their request and at Yahweh's command set up a bronze serpent upon which the victims might gaze and be healed.[5]

---

[1]Number 12.

[2]Num. 14: 22-30.

[3]Cf. Samuel's address to the Israelites. I Samuel 12. Here Samuel pleads his own honesty. In Moses' case, intercessory power was used to bring destruction.

[4]Num. 16: 33-34.

[5]Num. 21: 4b-9. Cf. II Ki. 18: 4. It is held that this and other allusions indicate a cultus in which the serpent was used as the symbol of deity. It was prevalent among the Levites of whom Moses was a member, before this tribe became attached to Judah in a priestly capacity.

The fate of the Amorites and the people of Bashan is similar to that which later befell the Canaanites.[1] Likewise, the victories were won in similar fashion, expressed in the word of Yahweh to Moses concerning Og, King of Bashan, "I am delivering him, all his people and his land into your power. . . . ."[2]

The incident of Balaam is given by the theocratic writer to indicate God's control of events, even over Israel's enemies. Balak, King of Moab, thrown into a panic because of the fate of Sihon and Og, summoned Balaam, a sorcerer, to come and curse the Israelites in order that a spell might be cast over them and victory be made easy for him. God overrode Balak's order. Balaam proceeded to the undertaking, but to the chagrin of his master Balak, could do nothing but bless God's chosen people. Enchantment and divination were utterly useless against the people whom God had brought out of Egypt.[3] Israel's position among nations is compared with that of a lion devouring its prey.[4] The strongest peoples had nothing with which to cope with Israel's all-powerful deity.

We come next to the theocratic interpretation of the conquest, the E "book" of Joshua.[5] The conquest of the promised land gave the theocratic writer his great opportunity to demonstrate the workings of the divine power in Israel's most difficult undertaking and he made the most of it. The theocratic version of the conquest like most of his additions has no more relation to factual history than a fairy tale but it served to illustrate the great ideal of the theocracy, that the strongest foe is no match for the people of God for whom God himself fights.

This phase of the theme also gave the theocratic writer an opportunity to illustrate his ideal of Hebrew cultural integrity and homogeneity. It offers further evidence that he was in constant fear of the danger of foreign innovations in his own age. Hence, he represents the Canaanites and all their possessions as

---

[1] Num. 12: 12-35. Cf. Josh. 7: 16-26.

[2] Num. 21: 34. [3] Num. 23: 23. [4] Num. 23: 24.

[5] Chapters 1-11. This section has been deuternomically edited. The JE book of Joshua is obtained by removing the Deuteronomic additions. However, there is only a small amount of J embedded in the "book." Cf. Brightman, op. cit.

placed under the ban--doomed to utter destruction.[1] This uncompromising attitude to foreign peoples and their gods is the negative side of the theocratic cultural particularism which resulted from a fusion of nationalism and prophetic idealism.

The theocratic writer has made one of his most important contributions from his point of view, in connection with the story of the founding of the monarchy.[2] Samuel is one of the greatest in the theocratic succession ranking next to Moses in importance. Similarly, as in the case of Moses, he is represented as having been born and reared under miraculous circumstances.[3] He was born in answer to the prayer of his mother Hannah who dedicated him to Yahweh for life.[4]

The young child was placed in the care of the priest Eli at the temple at Shiloh where he ministered while still very young. In a vision at night, the message of doom on the house of Eli came to the young Samuel. The priestly house was to fall because of the sinfulness of his sons which Eli had allowed to go on unrebuked. This vision constituted the definite call of Samuel to the theocratic office. We are told that "Samuel grew and Yahweh was with him and he let none of his words fall to the ground."[5] All Israel "from Dan to Beersheba recognized his office. Through this exaggerated representation of Samuel's office the theocratic writer visualizes a united Israel under a theocratic leader. Significantly, the author represents Samuel as a prophet of Yahweh,[6] like Abraham and Moses before him, the ideal theocratic type.

In contrast to kingly rule, a picture of the theocracy is given in the theocratic strand, I Sam. 7: 2--8: 22. The description begins with the statement that "all the house of Israel sought

---

[1] Josh. 7: 1f. Cf. I Samuel 15, Saul was commanded to destroy completely Agag and the Amalekites. His refusal to do so brought his downfall. The Deuteronomic editor of Joshua has given even greater emphasis to the use of the ban in the conquest of Canaan. He mentions it in numerous passages. Josh. 9: 24-25. Cf. Dt. 26: 10-18.

[2] I Samuel.

[3] I Sam. 1: 1-28, 2: 11-22a.

[4] I Sam. 1: 20-22.

[5] I Sam. 3: 19.

[6] I Sam. 3: 20. Cf. Gen. 20: 7.

after Yahweh."[1] The writer is definitely interested in a united Israel, culturally integrated. In addition, they are to be a people who were constantly alert in seeking the divine guidance. Samuel the theocrat is Yahweh's spokesman and informs them of the conditions of undivided loyalty. They must put away foreign gods and the Ashtartes and direct their attention to Yahweh and serve him alone. These were the only conditions under which they might receive divine aid in the present Philistine crisis.[2] In the theocrat's mind religious syncretism was the great evil of the day which he was seeking to combat. The people are said to have obeyed the command and put away the foreign deities and served Yahweh alone.[3] Then only were they prepared to approach Yahweh and enjoy the benefits of the theocratic intercession for them.

The functions of the theocrat in his capacity of intermediary between God and his religiously purified votaries are twofold, religious and secular. The people assembled at Mizpeh where by a libation and a period of fasting they prepared themselves for the confession of their sins. Thus by the intercessory powers of the theocrat the people were brought into a religiously pure state. Then only were they in condition to have Samuel plead with God their case arising from the Philistine situation. After duly offering sacrifices, Samuel cried to Yahweh in behalf of Israel and an answer was immediately forthcoming. Yahweh could answer by a demonstration of his power inasmuch as the Philistines were making an attack at the time. Yahweh simply thundered with his voice, the Philistines were confused and victory was at hand. Practically nothing was left for the Israelites to do. The victory was so complete that the Philistines never returned, we are informed.[4] This, of course, is as unreliable as the theocrat's story of the conquest, but it all expresses his conception of workings of divine power in an ideal society. There is no place for the mon-

---

[1] I Sam. 7: 3.

[2] The same warning against foreign deities appeared in connection with Jacob, Gen. 35: 2.

[3] In this "the wish was probably father to the thought." However, it illustrated how people should conduct themselves under the ideal government.

[4] I Sam. 7: 13.

archy in a society so constituted. It is definitely religious society dominated by a pure Yahwism. The God to whom they are thus loyal can and will protect them and give them victory in every crisis. What may be regarded as purely secular functions, are also cared for by the theocrat, for we are told that "Samuel judged the Israelites in Mizpeh."[1] The government is thus completely established under a single theocratic head.

It is important to note that the theocratic writer sets forth his ideal of Hebrew society before we come to his addition to the section dealing with the establishment of the monarchy.[2] His explanation of the reasons why the people desired a king are instructive. The sons of the great theocrat Samuel were guilty of corruption and bribery.[3] For this reason the elders came to Ramah to request a king.[4] The writer does not hesitate to criticize the corruption among the religious leaders of his day. Both priests and kings had been guilty of exploiting the masses.

Samuel was unyielding in his opposition to the establishment of the monarchy but Yahweh finally overrode his opposition and yielded to the clamoring. Says Yahweh, ". . . . . they have rejected me from being King over them."[5] In the writer's opinion, the monarchy and theocracy were mutually exclusive. The monarchy was entirely a concession to the Israelites.

The specific reasons given by the theocratic writer for his hostility indicate the exploitation and oppression that had grown up in his age.[6] He warns the people that the king will take their sons and daughters and press them into his service as charioteers, horsemen and farmers, and as perfumers, cooks and bakers. He will take a portion of their crops, a tithe of their herds.[7]

---

[1] I Sam. 7: 7.

[2] That is, he has added this expansion immediately before J's account of the establishment of the monarchy. He is interested in showing the magnitude of the people's error in rejecting a divine government in favor of a government of men.

[3] I Sam. 8: 1-3.

[4] I Sam. 8: 4.

[5] I Sam. 8: 7.

[6] I Sam. 8: 11-22.

[7] David had accepted the Canaanitic system with its fertility rite and imposed it on all. But it was not altogether popular even in Judah. Even the Sheikhs of the South did not favor it. While it was a system that readily lent itself to exploitation of the

But the blame for this catastrophe, he places on the people themselves for their clamoring to be like the nations.[1] He despairs of the cultural possibilities of the masses. There must, at least at the beginning, be a culturally unique nucleus.[2]

Having acceded to their request, Samuel summoned the Israelites to Mizpeh for the selection of the king, where he reluctantly proceeded with his task.[3] He first reminds them that God saved them in the Egyptian crisis and in subsequent calamities and distresses. The implication is that he can do so again. Nevertheless they despised him and asked for a king.

God and the king are set as opposites; the acceptance of one meant the rejection of the other. However, the process of selection proceeds under divine auspices. All the tribes of Israel are summoned. Yahweh himself makes the actual selection.[4] By elimination, the field is narrowed to the tribe of Benjamin and the young Saul from that tribe is chosen.

In the summary section dealing with the career of the theocrat Samuel, in a farewell address Samuel brings his work to a close.[5] The contrast of the ideal theocratic leader in the person of Samuel, with the corrupt exploiting king is forcibly set forth.[6] Of those things of which the king had been guilty, the theocrat was entirely innocent. "Whose ox have I taken? . . . . Whom have I defrauded?" queried Samuel. All answer: "You have not oppressed us . . . . nor have you taken anything from any-

---

masses by those in power, there was much of value in it. Out of it came the dominant cultus, the kingship, and a philosophy that gave recognition to the wonder and mystery of life. Cf. Wm. C. Graham, Prophets and Israel's Culture (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934)

[1] I Sam. 8: 20. The monarchy was a foreign importation as were the religious and cultural infiltrations.

[2] Cf. Jg. 7: 2-8.

[3] I Samuel 10.

[4] This would seem to be a contradiction in the theocratic writer's thinking in the fact that Yahweh should choose the first king. However, he cannot let a single event transpire without bringing it under divine control. Previously, he stated that Yahweh had acquiesced to the popular demand. I Sam. 8: 7.

[5] I Samuel 12. The theocratic writer summarizes at intervals the major phases of the entire theme. Cf. Joshua 24.

[6] I Sam. 12: 3.

one's hand."[1] Samuel then calls Yahweh to witness their testimony. He then proceeds to review in panorama the history of the Hebrew people from the Egyptian sojourn and Exodus to the beginning of the monarchy. He lists in order those theocrats through whom Yahweh had wrought deliverance: Moses, Aaron, and the four judges: Jerubbaal, Benak, Jephthah and Samson. Himself, the last in the succession, he does not mention. Despite the proved ability of Yahweh to cope with every emergency, the people rejected the divine kingship in favor of an earthly monarch.[2]

Samuel seems to accept the inevitable, however. There is one way to make the best of an undesirable situation. If both king and people serve Yahweh whole-heartedly and "not rebel against his commandment,"[3] it might still be well. But if they rebel against the commandment[4] Yahweh will bring destruction upon them.[5] To confirm his judgment in the matter, Samuel stages a little demonstration. By calling upon Yahweh, the latter sent a rain storm in the midst of the wheat harvest. This aroused such great fear in the people that they were in a proper frame of mind for Samuel's closing admonition.[6] There is no reconciliation between Samuel and the prevailing system. The people have been guilty of an unmitigated sin. Nevertheless, they can make some amends by putting away their idols and serving Yahweh whole-heartedly. Samuel still cherishes hopes for the future of his people inasmuch as Yahweh chose them to be his own for a special purpose. The defeat of that purpose would mean the loss of his own prestige.[7] But a degree of loyalty is still possible even under the unfavorable conditions of the monarchy. Thus Samuel admirably brings the theocratic succession to a close. The theocratic writer makes later contribu-

---

[1]The onus on the people is made all the heavier. They entered a solemn covenant, and repeatedly made solemn promises only to be disloyal in the end.

[2]I Sam. 12: 12.

[3]The "Commandment" referred to is obviously the legal system revealed to Moses at Sinai, as given in the theocratic strand.

[4]Ibid.

[5]I Sam. 12: 15. [6]I Sam. 12: 20-25.

[7]I Sam. 12: 22.

tions to the history of the monarchy but, obviously, there would be no place for a theocrat with the monarchy still in full power.

The ideal of the writer as regards cultural purity is further illustrated in his explanation of Saul's downfall.[1] Samuel naturally is superior to Saul and conveys to him the divine orders. Through Samuel, Saul is bidden to attack Amalek and utterly to destroy the people and all their possessions.[2] Saul, however, spared Agag and part of his possessions.[3] As a result of Saul's disobedience, Yahweh forthwith rejected him from the kingship.[4] The theocrat himself proceeded to complete the unfinished task and slew Agag with his own hands. The explanation indicates the writer's keen sense of the dangers that lay in cultural contamination from foreign sources.

Another explanation is offered for Saul's rejection, the reason being given that Saul inadvertently offered sacrifice, and in so doing usurped a function belonging to a duly constituted religious official. Samuel had arranged to come to Gilgal at the end of seven days to perform the ceremony. When he failed to appear, Saul himself took charge and performed the religious rite. For this, he is said to have been rejected from the kingship and in preference to him, "a man after God's own heart" is chosen, David, of course being meant.[5] If this is theocratic, it indicates the writer's desire for a secularization of the monarchy. If the monarchy is inevitable let the king's duties be confined to those of a strictly secular nature. The king as both religious and civil head of the state was most repugnant to the theocratic writer. As messianic head of the dominant religious system the opportunities given to the king when that office was in the hands of unscrupulous men, led to the great social abuses against which the theocrat and

---

[1] I Sam. 15: 2-34.

[2] Cf. the theocratic "book" of Joshua for the same ideal. The writer there has all Canaan placed under the ban.

[3] I Sam. 15: 9. [4] I Sam. 15: 26.

[5] I Sam. 13: 7b-15a. The section seems to be secondary to both of the main strands, J and theocratic. It is favorable to the monarchy and was obviously written by a David partisan. In all probability, it is Deuteronomic. Cf. Law of the King, Dt. 17: 14-20.

the prophets before him preached.[1]

The theocratic writer is not unsympathetic to David and Solomon and makes additions at numerous places in the records of their reigns. They cannot be thoroughgoing theocrats because they are kings. But he cannot easily dismiss them because they are great names in Hebrew history and he knows it. What he does do is to minimize their greatness by accounting for it as he usually does, as the working of the divine power among men. David was anointed as a mere lad.[2] His prowess as a warrior was shown very early, when as a young boy he slew Goliath.[3] The theocratic writer further indicates his sympathy for David by putting in Saul's mouth a confession in which he asserted that David, in sparing his life, was far more righteous than he himself.[4]

Solomon's greatness is accounted for by the fact that in a dream God appeared to him and granted him the fulfilment of his deepest desire, namely, the longing for wisdom.[5]

The contrast between the Samuel of J and the great theocratic Samuel is the most striking yet encountered. In the former he is a country seer hardly known beyond his own locality. He had the gift of second sight, and because of that ability was much in demand in his community. He first met the young Saul when he brought the latter aid in his search for his father's lost asses. He functions as the religious dignitary through whom the message is mediated from Yahweh to Saul of the latter's selection for the kingship. In J, however, when he had anointed Saul, his duties were completed.

In the theocratic strand he is one of the great figures of Hebrew history, being surpassed only by Moses. He is the medium

---

[1] Other passages assigned to E_2 or theocratic are I Sam. 17: 1-11, 14-58; 18: 1-4, 13-19; 19: 4-6, 8-17; 21: 10; 23: 19--24: 19, 25, 28; II Sam. 1: 6-10; 7. I Ki. 3: 4-13, Solomon's dream. I Kings 5, Solomon's preparation for the temple. Cf. II Samuel 7, 8: 15-19. Cf. II Samuel 7. Some of the Elisha stories may be theocratic although both the Elijah and Elisha stories seem to belong to distinct cycles that were incorporated in the narrative as it passed through its literary development.

[2] I Sam. 16: 1-13. [3] I Sam. 17: 1-58. (E_2 or theoctatic)

[4] I Sam. 24: 1-22. [5] I Ki. 3: 4-13.

through whom God conveys his protest to the Hebrew people for their colossal mistake in setting up the monarchy. He was the most influential man of his age, his fame reaching to the remotest parts of the kingdom, from "Dan to Beersheba." He is a prophet who by a mere plea to Yahweh can so manipulate the divine power as to bring a rain storm or complete victory over the Philistines. He is primarily a religious functionary but all phases of Hebrew life both religious and secular fall to his jurisdiction. He is said to have judged Israel at Mizpeh.[1] He is the last of the great theocratic line. Under him the theocracy is actually established and is said to have reached its greatest heights.

Out of J's "theophanic" line of deliverers, the theocratic author thus makes a line of theocrats. The theory of J is that of control of society by divinely energized individuals; the theory of the theocrat is one of divine control mediated through specially qualified persons. J emphasizes a homogeneous race, whereas the theocrat stresses a culturally integrated group. J has hopes for the political future of the Hebrew people. The theocrat thinks the future of the Hebrews lies in their distinctive culture. Both favor a united Hebrew people.

The theocratic philosophy of history is that God originally chose the Hebrews to be a distinctive group, loyal to him above all other gods. It was a kind of an experiment to bring glory to his own name. In return for their undivided loyalty and obedience to his commandments, he would favor them with material prosperity and protection from all their foes. It was with this end in view that he trained them as a group through these specially selected representatives, the theocratic line beginning with Abraham. The de-

---

[1] But there was, nevertheless, a delegation of power to the seventy elders. The Deuteronomic editor represents a point of view quite parallel to that of the theocrat. However, he is more favorable to the monarchy and, of course advocates centralization of worship at Jerusalem. Many of the theocratic ideas also receive greater emphasis in the Deuteronomic strand. For example, instead of Samuel judging Israel at one place, Mizpeh (I Sam. 7: 6), the Deuteronomist makes a "circuit rider" of him, I Sam. 7: 15, 16. (i. e. thus avoiding the idea that Mizpeh might have been the place where Yahweh "caused his name to dwell"). The similarity of point of view between the theocrat and the Deuteronomist has long been recognized. The so-called E_2, late E, which is but a part of the stratum we have designated as theocratic, Kuenen held to be Deuteronomic. Cf. A. Kuenen, Hist-Krit Einleitung p. 46.

velopment reached its climax in the covenant between God and the Hebrews effected through Moses. The group was thus duly constituted as a theocratic nation.

The two high points in the theocratic line were Moses and Samuel. The importance of the first we have indicated. The significance of the latter for the theocrat lay in the fact that it gave God an opportunity to register his great protest against the monarchy, in reality against J's conception of the Davidic dynasty. The positive side of the story of Samuel's work was the opportunity it gave the theocratic writer to set forth the workings of an ideal theocracy under a perfect theocrat.

Both of these great theocrats were accompanied or preceded by demonstrations of God's ability to handle any situation and to come off more than victorious. These were the Exodus from Egypt[1] and the Conquest of Canaan. Both, particularly the former, validated God's claims to be able to take care of the Hebrews in such a theocratic system as here proposed.

Whether the theocrat would have favored abolition of the monarchy is doubtful. And yet it was so closely tied up with the system he abhorred that he probably felt that to get rid of that system of exploitation practiced at the local shrines, its complete elimination must be accomplished. He at least constituted a great threat to the monarchy. His tone of finality and absoluteness may be accounted for in part by his prophetic psychology and the dire situation in which he wrote.

The prophetic elements in the theocrat's thinking may be seen in a number of phases. He has a more refined theological outlook than J, nowhere representing God in human form as in the earlier strand. He proclaims a high standard of personal conduct and as a consequence removes the unpleasant immoral features from many of J's characters. His sense of social justice is definitely prophetic. His protest against the abuses of the dominant system has been inspired as much by the work of the prophets preceding him as by his observation of the conditions of his own day. His

---

[1]The theocratic writer constantly calls attention to God's miraculous feat in the liberation of the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage. It was God who brought Judgment upon Israel's foe. Cf. Isaiah's attitude toward Egypt. Is. 19: 1-25; 31: 1-3.

conception of a theocratic society was in reality the implementing of the great prophetic ideal of justice and equality among men.[1] It is true that very often the theocrat verges on the magical. This may be due in part to overstatement, an overanxiety to make his point. His was a desperate manipulation of the facts of history to set forth a great truth, and thereby to influence the trends of his own day.

The theocratic attitude toward the cultus is essentially that of the prophets. However, he nowhere condemns sacrifice as, for example, Isaiah does.[2] But like the prophets, his great quarrel with the dominant system is based on the social injustices that have arisen from its abuse. His position may be more correctly described as one favoring a purified cultus. Everywhere he recognizes the legitimacy of sacrifice as a proper means of approach to the deity. Likewise, throughout his contribution he condemns foreign deities; idols receive his scathing denunciation. Child sacrifice he denounced.[3] He condemned the Baalistic rites of the North which were practiced under the form of the bull cultus.[4] His ideal is a Yahwism undefiled.

He has no word of criticism against the local shrines as such. Numerous references are made to the popular shrines. He describes the tent of meeting used during the desert wanderings which in a special way housed the presence of the deity.[5] If this was symbolic of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem, it would indicate his sympathetic attitude toward the whole apparatus of Hebrew religion. There would seem to be a tendency in the theocrat to compromise similar to that in the Deuteronomist soon to come upon the scene. His great criticism was leveled at the control of this system by the dynastic head of the nation. But the religious leaders are not immune to criticism.[6] Nor are the masses

---

[1] See Wm. C. Graham, The Prophets and Israel's Culture, Chapter VI, "The Expression of the Prophetic Philosophy of Life." Cf. Bad economic conditions described in theocratic source with the situation described in prophets, Amos 8; Hos. 7: 1-7; Isa. 3: 14; 5: 8.

[2] Is. 1: 11-13. [3] Genesis 22. [4] Exodus 32. [5] Ex. 33: 7-11.

[6] The sons of both Eli and Samuel abused their privileges.

of people themselves. It was the people themselves who clamored for Aaron to make the golden calf.[1] It was they who asked for a king.

Critics have made much of the Northern bias of E (theocratic). It is true that he gave preference to many Northern heroes, Reuben, Aaron, Joshua, Joseph, Ephraim, Samuel and so on. His greatest hero Moses was a Southerner, however. There is also a prevalence of Northern place names in his contribution, Bethel, Shechem, Jerico, Ai, and many others. But when we view his work from the standpoint of his philosophy of history and of social origins we see what a great injustice to the genius of his mind it would be to regard him as a Northern partisan. On the basis of social motivation and in view of J's philosophy of history which gave large place to the Judean Davidic dynasty and which the theocrat sought to modify or correct, an explanation of the latter's sympathy toward the North is not difficult to find. The theocrat is interested in the whole Hebrew people. Everywhere he emphasizes the unity of the Hebrews by the use of the recurring phrase, "all Israel."[2] Moreover, if the theocrat had had this Northern bias he would not have left so much of J standing. The Northern bias theory holds only if E was once a separate history. Viewed as an expansion of J, the Northern bias vanishes.

From the standpoint of style the theocratic source is generally held to stand below that of J. The obvious desire of the theocrat to use his materials to impress certain vital truths on the minds of his readers and thereby to influence situations is not as conducive to stylistic excellence as what may be regarded as the greater naïveté of J. While J has definite social motivations in recording the facts of his people's past, on the whole it may be said that he is more realistic than the theocrat in treating that data.[3] "J . . . . excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light: with a few

---

[1] Exodus 32.

[2] Josh. 3: 1; I Sam. 12: 1. It was the twelve tribes that entered into the covenant at Sinai. All the tribes were thus represented when the constitution of the nation was established.

[3] Cf. for example, the parallel stories of Abraham's prevarication concerning his wife Sarah, Genesis 12 and 20. J used much older material which was not originally told or written to influence situations and, of course, was more spontaneous than

strokes he paints a scene which, before he has finished, is impressed indelibly upon his reader's memory."[1] The theocrat's strong theological presuppositions color all his writing. The normal human qualities tend to become blurred in this sort of treatment. Samuel the country seer is transformed into a prophet, a maker and adviser of kings. In the theocrat's hands, the patriarch Abraham, who, in the older source was an admirable figure yet withal a combination of goodness and badness, becomes the paragon of virtue.[2] This kind of treatment tends to make the style of the theocrat less charming and more stilted than that of J. And yet at some points the theocrat rises to great stylistic heights. One has only to observe with what beauty and tenderness he tells the story of Abraham's testing by the command to sacrifice Isaac.[3] Similar qualities of style may be observed in the theocrat's account of the putting away of Hagar by Sarah.[4] A quality of style which may be designated as theological thus pervades his entire work.

His characteristic phraseology will now be examined. Abraham is a prophet (נָבִיא). In the case of Abimelech he intercedes (וְיִתְפַּלֵּל)[5] on the latter's behalf. We are not told that Moses is a prophet but he has in greatest abundance all the prophetic qualities of the true theocrat. As the great giver of the law he becomes the actual founder of the theocratic regime.[6] The writer uses the same expression for Moses' intercessory powers as in the account of Abraham.[7] Samuel exercises the same prophetic functions in interceding to God in behalf of his people. The same term (here וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל --I Sam. 7: 5) is used, as in the above passages.[8] The people need prophetic intercession because they have

---

[1] S. R. Driver, Introduction to Literature of Old Testament (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. 119.

[2] So also, E's David is a priggish boy paragon.

[3] Genesis 22.

[4] Gen. 20: 8-21. Cf. J's parallel account, Gen. 15: 4-14.

[5] Cf. Gen. 20: 7, 17.

[6] To others Yahweh speaks through the medium of dreams but to Moses face to face. Num. 12: 8.

[7] וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל --Num. 11: 2, 21: 7,8. [8] Cf. I Sam. 12: 19, 23.

sinned against Yahweh.[1] The explanation of the nature of their transgression is found in a later passage where the above expression is found.[2] Their sin is the forsaking of Yahweh and worship of Baals and Ashtartes. The same ideas expressed in identical literary form are found in the JE book of Judges.[3]

The same explanation of the underlying cause of his people's trouble, the theocrat expresses elsewhere in different terminology "they have forsaken me and served other gods"--(עזבוני ועבדו --I Sam. 8: 8. Cf. Josh 24: 16, 20).[4] A related idea is the theocratic command to "put away the strange gods." (הסירו את אלהי הנכר --I Sam. 7: 3). The identical expression is found much earlier in the theocratic source.[5]

In addition to the preference of E for Elohim[6] as the name of the deity, critics have pointed out among other distinguishing literary marks[7] the prevalence of the name Amorite for the non-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine. The theocratic writer applies this to the people in the land west of the Jordan.[8] He also applies it to the land east of the Jordan.[9] This term seemed to be in use among the prophets and later writers.[10]

The theocratic writer frequently alludes to the Egyptian

---

[1] I Sam. 7: 6.

[2] I Sam. 12: 10.

[3] Jg. 10: 10, 15.

[4] Cf. also Jg. 10: 13; I Sam. 12: 10. Cf. Jg. 2: 12, 13. I Sam. 7: 4, 12. Cf. Jg. 3: 7, 10: 6.

[5] Gen. 35: 24. Cf. Josh. 24: 14b, 20, 23; Jg. 10: 16.

[6] The theocratic writer sometimes construes Elohim as a plural. Cf. Gen. 20: 13, 35: 7; Josh. 24: 19.

[7] Cf. Driver, op. cit., p. 119. E prefers Horeb to Sinai as the mountain of God, Jethro not Hobab as the father-in-law of Moses.

[8] Gen. 15: 16, 48: 22; Josh. 24: 12, 15, 18. Cf. I Sam. 7: 14. Cf. Jg. 6: 10. J uses Canaanite. Gen. 10: 19, 12: 6, 13: 7, 24: 3, 37, 34: 30, 50: 11. Cf. Ex. 13: 11; Jg. 1: 4, 5.

[9] Num. 21: 21, 31.

[10] Am. 2: 9, 10. Cf. II Sam. 21: 2.

sojourn and the miraculous divine intervention and rescue of the Israelites.[1] Several other characteristic theocratic expressions[2] may be mentioned: "With all your heart";[3] "prepare your hearts unto Yahweh";[4] "Cry out to Yahweh . . . . that he may save us";[5] "oppress."[6] A favorite allusion, of course, is to Yahweh as the nation's king.[7] Reference has been made to the theocratic writer's fondness for dreams as a medium of revelation. He mentions the dream as the means of a theophany. In this manner God came to Abimelech and warned him of the danger he faced if he harmed Sarah.[8] A similar theophany was experienced by Laban.[9] With these may be compared the appearance of God to Balaam.[10] The dream appears regularly in the theocratic material of the Joseph stories experienced both by Joseph[11] and Pharaoh as well as by the latter's servants.[12] In the theocratic portions in the later part of the historical corpus, two occasions are given in which the dream served as a channel of revelation. Yahweh refused to answer Saul's questionings by means of a dream.[13] Yahweh favored Solomon by an appearance in a dream in which he granted him his request for wisdom.[14]

---

[1] I Sam. 12: 6, 8. Cf. Josh. 24: 4-6, 17.

[2] For a complete list. Cf. Driver, op. cit., p. 177.

[3] I Sam. 7: 3, 20, 24. [4] I Sam. 7: 3. Cf. Josh. 24: 23.

[5] צעק - - - - - - - - I Sam. 7: 8. Cf. Jg. 3: 9, 10: 10, 12. Cf. "Children of Israel cried to Yahweh." Jg. 3: 15, 6: 6, 7; I Sam. 12: 8, 10.

[6] לחץ --I Sam. 10: 18b. Cf. Jg. 6: 8f., 10: 11f.

[7] I Sam. 8: 7, 10: 19, 12: 12, 17-19.

[8] Gen. 20: 3. [9] Gen. 31: 24.

[10] Num. 22: 20.

[11] Gen. 37: 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 19, 20, 42: 9.

[12] Gen. 40: 5, 8, 9, 16, 41: 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 22, 25, 26, 32.

[13] I Sam. 28: 6, 15.

[14] I Ki. 3: 5, 15. Both this and the reference in I Samuel belong in a late secondary stratum and give every indication of belonging to the theocratic source. The point of view is not far removed, however, from that of Deuteronomy.

This brief sketch of characteristic expressions of the theocratic writer serves not only to give us a general conception of his literary style but to confirm our view that the source is continuous throughout the corpus.

With the characteristics of the theocratic strand before us it remains to determine the author's social provenance and to formulate our theory of the literary character of his contribution, that is, whether it is an independent document of an expansion of J's narrative.

A large majority of critics have held the opinion that the so-called E document was produced in an age of prosperity. It was believed that the source reflected an age of general well being and contentment. Says Brightman: "E's mood of theocratic national pride and joy on the whole presupposes a period of national prosperity, such as the reign of Jereboam II, 783-743."[1] Cornill has this to say of E's date:

> Thus if E, as is generally admitted, belongs to the Northern Kingdom, we have a terminus ad quem for his work in the year 722, and the whole manner of his recital, the strongly marked national sentiment and the naive joy--dashed by no shadow of misfortune--which he unaffectedly displays in the supremacy of Joseph and his kingdom, must lead us to conclude that this great history came into existence in a relatively prosperous period of the Kingdom of Israel. As the influence of prophetic ideas is clearly perceptible, a time is suggested when this spiritual phenomenon had become a shining power in Israel; and further, as we are precluded by the very fact that E's recital is not the most ancient from putting it too far back, all these considerations are met and satisfied by a date within the last glorious period of Israel's history in the long and brilliant reign of Jereboam II, i.e. about 750; and this conclusion also agrees with the verdict of Stade and Kuenen."[2]

Our contention is that both its psychology and ideology are definitely against this position.[3] In the first place, as we have seen, the writer is hostile to the monarchy. From this we may conclude that the monarchy either in the North or South or in both sections,

---

[1]E. S. Brightman, op. cit., p. 121.

[2]Carl Cornill, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), p. 80.

[3]During the "age of prosperity" of Jeroboam II, Israel did enjoy a period of temporary affluence. Her boundaries were then at their greatest dimensions but it was a spurious prosperity as Amos and Hosea pointed out.

regardless of where the author lived and wrote, was not successful in bringing happiness to its subjects. At least that was true for a minority group if the theocratic party did represent a minority. Again, the theocratic writer constantly inveighs against social injustice, the cure of which was one of the great objectives of his work. This would hardly point to an age of general well being. Furthermore, the supernatural is everywhere exalted. The psychology of the writer as indicated by this phenomenon clearly points to a time of insecurity. Unfortunately, it is a characteristic of human nature to rely on divine aid only when human resources are unavailing. The ancients depended far more heavily on supernatural resources than do moderns. From such sources came the guarantee of their military success and the assurance of a plentiful supply of material goods. We may be sure that the theocrat's ringing call to a renewed faith in the unlimited power of the deity reflects an age when whatever prosperity was enjoyed was, in his opinion, a spurious one and seriously threatened or that it was such a time of despair and gloom that faith in the very source of life was shattered. In any case, we are forced to the conclusion that he wrote during a critical period of Hebrew history.[1]

The orthodox-critical theory holds that E (theocratic) was of Northern origin, as indicated by the preference of its author for Northern persons and places. Its purpose, so critics have concluded was a history of the Hebrew people parallel to J's history that would be palatable to Northern readers. This is offered as the motivation of the E writer. But this is primarily a political motivation. It means that he is setting off the Northern Kingdom against Judah. Our study of E has shown that its author is violently opposed to the monarchy in either the South or the North. Political institutions have no place in his system. We have seen that his emphasis is rather on a distinctive culture. And culture seldom knows such severe geographical limitations as the critical

---

[1]The orthodox-critical scholars seem to view ancient literature as produced to glorify happy and desirable situations rather than to solve present problems. But ancient literature always had a two-fold reference: to the author's present time, and to the age when the events occurred. Usually the reference to the author's own age received the greater emphasis growing out of the functional character of the literature.

view would impose upon E. It is true the theocrat champions an exclusive Hebrew culture which has in it an element of nationalism but it is a culture that embraces the whole Hebrew people. In his panoramic view of history, he sees the Hebrew people as a distinctive cultural entity from the beginning of their history. Under the divine tutelage that entity was kept intact and its culture kept free from pollution through the agency of the theocratic line, until, in the fullness of time, God could, by fuller revelation, give them a complete legal system[1] for the government of the theocratic society and for the maintenance of their cultural integrity. God had delivered them in every emergency.[2] He gave them the land he had promised to them. By a series of theocrats, the judges,[3] he brought them safely through the perilous years of their early residence in Palestine. Finally, the full implications of the Sinaitic covenant were fully realized in the model theocratic society under the perfect theocrat Samuel. Such a culturally integrated group could not be confined to the North or the South. All the tribes entered into the covenant relationship. All of them engaged in the conquest of Canaan. Everywhere, he emphasizes the fact that "all Israel" participated in the significant events of Hebrew history. We may safely conclude, therefore, that the theocrat was writing for the whole Hebrew people. It follows then that he could have been a dweller in Judah as well as in the North. His sympathy for the North can be explained as a strategy to promote the cultural unity he so ardently was seeking.

The theocrat's strong feeling about the social inadequacy of secular power points to a time when the monarchy was in full decline. His quarrel with the monarchy was twofold: it had fostered social injustice[4] and had failed to cope with the danger of foreign cultural domination.[5] If the theocrat lived and wrote at a time

---

[1] E decalogue and Book of the covenant revealed at Sinai.

[2] In J, deliverance was wrought by Yahweh-energized deliverers. In the theocratic strand God himself is the deliverer.

[3] The judges mentioned (I Samuel 12) Banak, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson.

[4] I Samuel 8.

[5] I Samuel 15.

when the monarchy had failed to deal adequately with political situations his hostility would be all the greater. Particularly, would this be true if he had seen the dismal political failure of the monarchy at Samaria. This would strike him all the more forcibly because he did not share J's view of the peculiarly distinctive character of the Davidic dynasty.[1] His feeling of despair of any success under the monarchical system would also be greatly heightened if he was a contemporary of the politically weak Hezekiah[2] and the culturally corrupt Manasseh. In that case, there would be fresh in his mind also the memory of Ahaz[3] who was the despair of the prophet Isaiah. Not only did Ahaz make a wretched failure of his foreign policy but he was guilty of a religious innovation in the matter of the Assyrian altar which he saw at Damascus and a replica of which he had constructed at Jerusalem.

In his criticism of the monarchy, the theocrat was faced with J's rigid theory of the divine origins of the system and the divinity of the person of the king. The voice of the king was the voice of God, seemed to be the principle that dominated the kingship for J.[4] The task of combatting this theory of the nature of the kingship was a most formidable one. One does not wonder that the theocratic writer went to great extremes in his hostility to the dominant system. It would seem to be a highly tenable view that the theocrat's extreme hostility to the whole monarchical system can only be explained if he were a Judean[5] and close to the

---

[1]After the fall of Samaria the Northern Kingdom was an Assyrian province. The theocratic writer would have a special interest in keeping the Northerners Hebrew. Cf. H. O. Hatcher, M. A. thesis, "The Status of the Israelites after the fall of Samaria."

[2]Jerusalem all but fell at the hands of Senaccherib in 701. The latter says he took forty-seven walled cities of Judah. Besides that, Hezekiah paid a huge bounty to the Assyrian King to save his Kingdom, II Kings 18.

[3]Isaiah 7. Cf. II Ki. 15: 32-38, 16.

[4]Cf. Ahab and his relations with Miciah who challenges this position. I Kings 22.

[5]Cf. Abraham Kuenen, An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886). Kuenen holds to an E_2 stratum that originated in Judah.

Davidic succession where he was an immediate observer of its failure. Moreover, he would be, in that case, fully cognizant of the buttressing which J's history had given the monarchy. If he were a resident of the North where the person of the king was not so sacred[1] he would not have been so apt to feel such an aversion to the system.

The question arises: How was the theocratic idealist to counteract the influence of J's history? Undoubtedly that history was extremely popular having had little short of two centuries of circulation.[2] If he was to criticize effectively the system, he had to attack the philosophy on which it rested. There were two ways by which this could be done. He could write an entirely new history embodying in it his own philosophy of history and hope for a favorable reception from the public. On the other hand, he could modify J's history by changes, omissions and additions. In antiquity there was no copyright law forbidding such treatment of one writer's work by another author. In fact we have abundant evidence that it was done constantly. There is no question in our minds as to which method would gain for the theocrat the readier attention of the public. To try to supplant J with an entirely new history would have been an impossible task. Such reasoning leads us to the conclusion that the theocratic author's great literary effort consisted in the corrective expansion of the Judean history.[3]

The literary evidence also favors this view. When we examine the stories of Gideon, Jephthah and Samson, we find no evidence whatsoever for the presence of a third hand in the production of the JE version of the stories.[4] In the last two stories the

---

[1]No dynasty in the North had achieved the sanctity which David's line enjoyed in Judah.

[2]Written about 840 B. C. on our view.

[3]The critical school, which has always recognized J and E as independent sources, has looked upon their authors as assemblers of sagas. This is only partially true because it would be difficult to harmonize this view with the evidence that each source is characterized by a linguistic stamp as well as a definite religious and theological viewpoint.

[4]Our theory is, of course, that J has originally used Elohistic stories and modified them from his point of view. The theocrat then expanded them further. This might be considered as

theocrat added only a few verses to modify J's point of view. In the Gideon story he has added larger sections but these, when pieced together, as we saw, do not in any sense constitute a complete story. If an editor has injected them here he has omitted some of the most important elements of the theocratic source. Of course this could be explained on the ground that an editor felt that this would be mere duplication and added only the distinctive portions from the theocratic narrative. But we have practically no material from such a hypothetical editor. Furthermore, that is exactly what the theocratic editor himself has done, added distinctive passages to J's work to modify J's treatment in order to emphasize his own point of view. The expansions by the theocrat constitute by far the smaller portion of the JE book of Judges.

We have a somewhat different situation in the "book" of Joshua, although the literary phenomenona of that book are not unlike those of Judges. Here the theocrat extends himself, as we have seen. The bulk of the first eleven chapters of Joshua is theocratic. Only a comparatively small number of J verses are found in Joshua and these are scattered throughout the book. The question arises why there is this preponderance of theocratic material here and not in Judges. There is no answer on the basis of the exclusively literary approach. Why would the alleged editor R^{JE} show such a preference for the theocratic material in Joshua and not in Judges? Here again we have no literary remains by which to judge this editor in seeking an answer to the question just posed. When we approach the problem functionally it is not difficult to solve. When we understand J's philosophy of history we can readily understand how he would touch lightly on this phase of his theme. There was probably little heroism and no heroes to be Yahwized. But it was the theocrat's big opportunity. Next to the Exodus, the conquest was, in his opinion, God's greatest feat. The JE "book" of Joshua is simply a great expansion of what was probably a very brief treatment by J of this phase of the theme.

The question arises, why, in case of parallel sections, the editorial expander did not omit the earlier parallel to avoid repetition. But the positing of an editor R^{JE} is no aid toward

---

a three-fold authorship. Our reference of a third hand was to an alleged editor R^{JE} who combined J and E.

the solution of this problem. The same question arises why such an editor did not choose the parallel section that suited him and omit the other. The answer may be found in the practical considerations attending the matter. Although great editorial liberties were permissible, documents gained a certain sacredness and sanction after passing through several generations of readers. Such was the experience of the J history. The theocratic author could only hope to gain attention for his point of view by modifying or expanding the original story or by injecting his own version of the given incident somewhere in the accepted narrative. Both methods were used. For example of the latter method, observe the parallel accounts of David's sparing of Saul's life, I Samuel 26 (J) and I Sam. 24: 1-22 (E). Almost two centuries of readers had learned to love the former story. To have omitted it would have been extremely hazardous and would have prejudiced the author's readers against his literary efforts. Observe also the two parallel accounts of Abraham's experiences with Sarah, Gen. 12: 10-20 (J) and Gen. 20: 1-18 (E). The motif is exactly the same in both. In the theocratic story the author has, of course, set forth his distinctive ideology, which was the purpose of the retelling. But to avoid repetitiousness, he has changed the setting from Egypt to the Philistine country. This phenomenon is far more easily explained on the ground that the theocratic author wrote his version of the story knowing that it would appear in the same narrative alongside the older story. He thus succeeded in adding some variety to the narrative at this point. At the same time he accomplishes his purpose without destroying the identity of the original narrative.

Critics have found evidence for their theory of the editorial union of two independent sources in the JE document by the presence of occasional harmonistic or editorial verses which they attribute to the editor (R^{JE}) who did such a phenomenal work.[1]

---

[1] One of the greatest weaknesses of the Wellhausen reconstruction as we have contended is the positing of this editor R^{JE}. If there was such an editor he becomes the most important figure in the evolution of JE. He it was who caught the vision of a united people and sought to express this unity by thus combining the literature of the North and the South. But we are unable to form any judgment as to his distinctive ideas, his purpose or motivation.

These verses are, however, comparatively few.[1] It is true that many of the transitions from one stratum to the other are not smooth. In some places obvious effort has been made to make the joints less rough by the injection of such harmonistic verses. There is no valid reason to suppose that the theocratic editorial expander was not as much interested in an artistic literary product when he had finished as some later editor. Such a verse as that found in I Sam. 9: 9, and generally recognized as harmonistic, presents no distinctive point of view whereby we can determine the position of an alleged editor and could easily have been inserted by the theocrat himself. The numerous liberties taken with the text by copyists and editors in the long course of the evolution of Hebrew literature is also well known and might well account for many additions of this type. To suppose that many of the verses now attributed to the editor R^{JE} were injected by late editors and copyists does not in the least affect the hypothesis here proposed. From the standpoint both of literary characteristics and social motivation, therefore, the hypothesis that the E (or theocratic) strand is an editorial expansion is here offered as the most satisfactory solution to the problem of JE.

Before proceeding to the final phase of the question, namely, that of determining the theocrat's social provenance, the question may be raised concerning the nature of the system which the theocrat would have substituted for the monarchy. Did he really believe that the monarchy would be displaced? In reply, it may be said that there were probably plenty of signs on the horizon that indicated to the keen observer that the monarchy was decadent and doomed. Particularly would this be true, as previously indicated, if Samaria had fallen. It may be that the most he could hope for was the decentralization of power and the secularization of the royal functions. In regard to the system he would set up, we should not expect him to be too specific and detailed. He was an idealist and idealists are seldom noted for their practical-mindedness. The theocrat was in the prophetic tradition. And the main forte of the prophets was criticism of

---

[1] Verses assigned to R^{JE}: I Sam. 11: 12-14, 15: 1; Gen. 18: 19, 23-33a; Gen. 13: 16, 16: 10, 18: 18, 22: 17, 18, 26: 4, 32: 12. These resemble the theocratic and Deuteronomic strands and might well have originated from these editors.

the status quo.[1] They were certainly not social planners. Their great strength lay in their attack on the underlying philosophy of the system that had generated the evils they so roundly denounced. That is exactly what the theocratic writer has done but, unlike the great eighth century prophets, he did it by rewriting the entire history of his people.[2]

That his work was a threat to the monarchy is borne out by the Deuteronomic movement later. The latter movement sought to revivify the monarchy by a combined effort to infuse prophetic idealism into both the cultus and the governing body.[3]

The work of the theocrat, however, was the foundation for the system that was to rise on the ruins of the monarchy, namely, the legalistic-ecclesiastical system in post-exilic times. His literary efforts constitute the most ambitious and constructive prophetic attack in the Old Testament on the philosophy of the dominant system. It follows then that the prophetic movement must have been approaching the peek of its strength and influence. If this is true, the currently accepted date of 750 is much too early. Moreover, the monarchy was hardly weak enough at that time to draw from him such a bitter denunciation, particularly during the reign

---

[1]Cf. Isaiah and his criticism of Ahaz' foreign policy. What policy Isaiah would have substituted has always been a puzzle. Perhaps the answer is to be found in Isaiah's philosophy embodied in the passage 31: 3. Reliance on the "Holy One of Israel" rather than on human resources, is advocated. Like the theocrat who followed him, Isaiah places great emphasis on the distinctive culture as the basis of political success. Isaiah at first opposed the Assyrian Alliance in the Syro Ephraimitic crisis. But after Ahaz had made such an alliance he advocated loyalty to it. Isaiah seemed to be saying to Ahaz "now that you have made your bed, lie in it."

[2]The religious problems faced by J and E, one criterion for the judgment of which is found in their use of divine names, were quite different. J's Yahwizing tendencies indicates that when he wrote, Yahweh was having a struggle for supremacy among the Hebrew people. At various times his supremacy was seriously threatened, by the Tyrian Baal, by the bull deity of Jereboam I, and so on. When the theocrat wrote, this struggle had ceased. Practically all Hebrews were at least nominal Yahwists. The great danger was syncretism, an impure Yahwism caused by infusions from numerous sources. The difference is shown by the theocrat's rather loose use of divine names. He uses the names Yahweh and Elohim so interchangeably that when either is used his readers will know at once that the same deity is meant.

[3]Cf. Deuteronomic law of the king, Dt. 17: 14f.

of the comparatively strong Jereboam II of Israel.

To insist on the Northern origins of E (theocratic) is to misinterpret the writer's obvious sympathy for the North. But his whole emphasis is on the unity of the Hebrew people. "All Israel" was to be under the sway of the theocracy. It may be that the theocrat cherished a secret fondness for Israel inasmuch as she had broken away from the Judean Davidic system. However, she set up a similar system that in many respects was worse. At any rate, his Northern sympathies are easily explained in the light of his philosophy. After the fall of Samaria (721), there were many Israelites remaining in the North although numerous colonists had been settled in their midst. There must have been little hope for the future among these people. The theocrat seeks to revive that hope by giving them special recognition in the history of the whole group. Furthermore, such favoritism was a necessary strategy on the part of the theocrat in his efforts to combat the philosophy of the monarchical system whose roots J had so thoroughly entrenched in Judean tradition. So far as any political bias in favor of either North or South is concerned, the theocrat could have been from either section. His geographical location is unimportant. His great attack on the prevailing system is not geographically conditioned.

Briefly sketching the series of events during the century following the appearance of the writing prophets (about 750), we find that following closely on the great prophetic attack[1] on the prevailing system, the Northern Kingdom passed forever from the scene (721). In 701 the Southern Kingdom under Hezekiah all but suffered the same fate when Sennacherib made his great compaign to the West. The clouds of political disaster were dark and forboding. If Hezekiah had shown interest in correcting some of the abuses of the cultus,[2] he was utterly impotent, as was Ahaz before him, in his efforts to give Judah any sort of political stability and security.

Under his successor, Manasseh, there was some improvement in the political situation although Manasseh paid tribute to

---

[1] Amos and Hosea in the North; Isaiah and Micah in Judah.

[2] II Ki. 18: 1-6.

Assyria throughout his reign. But under the latter king the monarchy reached its lowest ebb of cultural debauchery.[1] Manasseh erected altars for Ball worship comparable to that of the Tyrian Baal, an innovation brought into the North by Ahab of Israel.[2] He built altars for the host of heaven, a Babylonian importation.[3] Child sacrifice was practiced.[4]

The monarchy had proved itself utterly unable to provide the Hebrew people any guarantee of political security. But that was not enough. As if to add insult to injury, the shortsighted Manasseh, by wholesale importations, thus sought to corrupt completely if not wipe out entirely the very thing by which the Hebrews might yet gain distinction, their culture. A situation such as this is necessary to explain the bitterness of the theocrat, as manifested in those words spoken concerning two ancient kings and put in the mouth of Gideon: "Accordingly, when Yahweh delivers Zebah and Zalmunna into my hands, I will trample your bodies among desert thorns and briers."[5]

It is from the situation well toward the end of Manasseh's reign (about 650) that the social motivations of the theocratic expansion can be derived. It was the last desperate effort of protest on the part of the prophetic movement against the system they held to be responsible for the ill fate of the Hebrews.[6] The Deuteronomist,[7] soon to come on the scene, sought to reconcile the two groups and to save the monarchy by infusing the ideals of the prophets into the system that was, however, destined shortly to disappear forever.

---

[1]II Ki. 21: 1-18. [2]II Ki. 21: 3. [3]II Ki. 21: 4, 5.

[4]II Ki. 21: 6. Cf. The theocratic condemnation of child sacrifice in the story of the Sacrifice of Isaac. Genesis 22.

[5]I Jg. 7: 7.

[6]The prophets exerted great influence on history. Cf. Elijah's revolt against Ahab and Tyrian Baalism. The fate of the Omi dynasty was thereby foreshadowed. Note also the influence of Jeremiah in a political crisis.

[7]Both the theocratic writer and the Deuteronomist tried to modify the monarchy, which was thus founded on the world pattern. The protesting prophets led the theocratic movement whereas naturalistic prophecy was more in the foreground in the Deuteronomic movement. Naturalistic prophecy had always been in vogue because it's strength lay in the mutual support given to and received from the monarchy.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

To the fact that the Wellhausen solution of the problem of J and E has won wide acceptance among Old Testament scholars reference was made at the outset of this study. There has been some divergence from the accepted solution has also been noted. Among those not satisfied with the old theory, the most notable contribution has been made by Volz and Rudolf in their monograph titled, "Der Elohist als Erzahler ein irrweg Der Pentateuch Kritik?"[1] This is a brilliant literary study of the book of Genesis, or rather of Chapters 15 to 50 of Genesis to which section the E strand has traditionally been confined for that book. The main attack on the accepted theory is leveled at the grounds on which the analysis has rested, chiefly on the variation in divine names. The result is that they relegate a large part of the E material to J. The attenuated E strand is regarded by these scholars as an editorial expansion of the J narrative.

Volz and Rudolf object to the minute textual criticism that divides verses into halves and quarters. Rudolf expresses his thesis in these words: "es gibt in der Genesis Keinen E als durchlaufende Quelle d. h. als eine zusammenhängende Darstellung von sagenhaften oder geschtlichen Begebenheiten im Sinne des Jahwisten. . . . ."[2] Whole sections that have traditionally been ascribed to E, they assign to the Jahwistic author. Among these may be mentioned 20: 1-17, 21: 8-21, and 22: 1-14. In Genesis 22, the story of Abraham's testing, here

---

[1]Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 63 (Giessen: A Töpelmann, 1933).

[2]Ibid., p. 145. Rudolf is the author of the section treating Chapters 37-50.

as elsewhere they find an alternation of divine names, a phenomenon unexplainable on the basis of the source theory. The traditional reasons for assigning the chapter to E, the prevalence of the divine name Elohim, the appearance of God to Abraham in the night, the call of the angel from heaven, Abraham's dwelling in Beersheba, the religious tone of the section, they find offer inadequate grounds for the theory that the section belongs to the Elohistic author. They assign it to the "Haupterzähler" of the whole book whom they regard as J.[1] They point out that J uses Jahweh and Elohim interchangeably elsewhere. This interchange of names in J is explained on the grounds that in some instances Elohim is an appellative used when reference is made to the divine character; at other times J puts into the mouths of foreigners or of Hebrews when conversing with foreigners the divine name Elohim.[2] These explanations are inadequate to account for J's use of both names in some sections, for example, the creation story Genesis 2: 4b. Nor will they explain the strange mixture of divine names in the judges' stories, as we have seen. The authors admit that Gen. 20: 1-17 and 21: 8-21 present difficulties for their thesis. They recognize a later hand in these sections but he has merely worked over and occasionally retouched the original Jahwistic narrative.[3]

Many sections long recognized as composite, they assign wholly to J. Among these may be mentioned chapters 27, 28: 10-22, 31: 17-43, 32: 1-22 and 37. It is unnecessary to argue in detail the composite character of these sections. That there is more than one strand in material such as that found in chapter 37 is evident even to the casual reader. Furthermore, it is perfectly obvious that in chapter 20: 1-17 where the same motif is found as in chapter 12, we are in an entirely different social milieu from that of the latter section. The motif is all that the two sections have in common. The ideology, psychology and theological sophistication of chapter 20 point clearly to an entirely different social provenance from that of chapter 12. While we are in agreement with Volz and Rudolf in our contention that E (theocrat) did

---

[1] Ibid., p. 43.

[2] Ibid., pp. 15, 16, 180, 181.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

not produce a separate independent history similar to that of J, it is our belief that a faulty methodology has led them far astray. In their violent reaction to the artificiality of the Graf-Wellhausen reconstruction, they have over-played their hand. Their entire work is a glowing example of the subjectivity which may characterize the results of a literary methodology when not checked with the functional aspects of the author's production viewed as a whole.

The procedure of Volz and Rudolf is quite instructive from our point of view. They constantly quote critics who are in disagreement on the minutiae of textual problems and with whom they themselves disagree not only on the details but in general results. So far as methodology is concerned, one can discover very little difference from that of the older criticism. In the matter of their general reconstruction, the theory of Volz and Rudolf has the virtue of greater simplicity. But in both methodology and results their work is of a literary nature as was that of their predecessors. This is the main criticism that may be made of this newer approach to our problem. Nowhere does it attempt to motivate the literature by determining the function it was designed to serve in the situation from which it emerged.

It is our contention that the problem of J and E can be solved only by approaching the literature as a corpus. If our theory of the philosophy of history found in J and E, which has grown directly out of their social milieu, is even approximately correct, it follows that such a theory of their peoples' past as thus set forth throughout their entire treatment of the history, cannot be determined on the basis of any one "book" but must rest on a given strand in its entirety. This is our reason for insisting that the dogma of the Hexateuch must be resolutely excluded from our critical apparatus.

The position of Volz and Rudolf has been examined at this point mainly to indicate the fact that there is dissatisfaction with the orthodox critical solution of the Pentateuchal problem and to show the futility of attempting a solution unless a more adequate methodology is employed.

The solution must be intended for the problem of the origins of J and E is in general accord with the "Chicago Hypothesis" or the divided-entry theory of early Hebrew history. This reconstruction of the events of the conquest of Palestine

is due largely to the work of Professors Luckenbill, Smith and Meek who set forth their views in a number of articles to which reference will be made. An examination of that hypothesis is in order at this point to determine the bearing it has on our problem.

After criticism had done its work in thoroughly discrediting the biblical representation[1] of a united entry into Palestine, the task remained of bringing into some kind of harmony the various events leading up to the conquest and the actual entry itself. Many questions were pressing for an answer. Among these may be mentioned those of an Egyptian sojourn, the number of tribes that were actually engaged in it, the date of the going down to Egypt and the Exodus. Was there ever such a movement around the Dead Sea as that represented in Numbers? The part played by the Habiru mentioned in the Amarna letters and the date of the fall of Jerico had to be related to these other events. In addition, the place of Moses and Joshua in the series of events had to be evaluated. Not only the data provided by the Bible itself but the evidences from extra-biblical sources, such as archaeological finds, the Amarna letters, Ras Shamra tablets, the Merneptah Stela and so on have all been employed in the formulation of the reconstruction. But the evidence is so conflicting and sometimes so contradictory as to permit of no simple solution.

> The difficulty which results in such contrary conclusions seems to arise from the fact that all the evidence, biblical and extrabiblical alike, gives some ground for placing the entry into Egypt, the oppression, the exodus and the settlement in Canaan, at more than one point in history. The confusion has largely risen, no doubt, because, in the Old Testament, traditions which originally had little or no chronological relationship have been telescoped. In such a situation the scientific procedure would seem to be the repudiation of irreconcilably conflicting hypotheses and the endeavor to formulate on which might reconcile the apparently contradictory evidence.[2]

At the outset it may be said that the Hebrews were in

---

[1] This is mainly in the theocratic strand as we have seen. J left the impression that the conquest was slowly accomplished by tribes acting independently or in small groups. Cf. Josh 11: 15-23 (E). Josh. 15: 13-19, 63, 16: 10, 17: 11; Jg. 1: 10-21, 27-36 (J).

[2] W. C. Graham and H. G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 73.

Palestine much earlier than we have been accustomed to think.[1] The earliest entry is probably to be dated at the time of the Hyksos invasion. The place name Jacob-el (her) is thought to have come to Palestine as a deposit from the Hyksos invasion.[2] One Hyksos chieftain recorded his name on many scarabs as Jacob-her. The opinion persists, therefore, that there were Hebraic elements in the Hyksos hordes. If so, we may put the beginning of the Hebrew movement into Palestine as early as the Sixteenth Century.

The presence of Hebrews in Palestine was continuous from these early times. Evidences for this may be found in the Theban lists of Thothmes III (1479-1447), Ramses II (1292-1225) and Ramses III (1198-1167) which give the name Y-q - b-r as the designation of a place in the western part of central and northern Palestine.[3] The 'sr found in the lists of Seti I (1315-1292) and Ramses II (1292-1225) is generally held to indicate Hebrew residence in the northwest of Palestine at a place identified as Asher.

The evidence of the Amarna letters (reign of Amenophis III and IV [1411-1358]) points to a vigorous movement of the Habiru into Palestine who are identified as the Sagaz peoples. The Habiru embrace a wider group than Israel, including the Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites. The name Israel appears for the first time on the stela of Merneptah (1225-1215). These evidences indicate continuous activity of the Hebrews in Palestine from the time of the Hyksos onward.

The great push of Aramean[4] hordes occurred in the Fifteenth Century, however. It was then that the poorer hill lands were seized from the Canaanites along with such cities as Jerico, Shechem, Gilgal, Shiloh and Bethel. The stronger fortified cities like Jerusalem, Megiddo and Gezer could not be taken at that time

---

[1] Cf. Genesis 14. The historicity of this is doubtful. Cf. Jg. 11: 26. The Hebrew occupancy east of the Jordan is said to have been three hundred years.

[2] Cf. J. M. P. Smith, "Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion," A. J. S. L. XXXII (1915-16), 81ff.

[3] Ibid., pp. 82. 83.

[4] Cf. Gen: 29: 10, 31: 20, 25: 20; Deut. 26: 5.

by the central Joseph tribes. It is held by Meek that the early leadership of part of this group fell to Hoshea whom he identifies with Joshua (Num. 13: 16. Cf. Num. 13: 8; Deut. 32: 44).[1] Hoshea soon organized a loose confederacy at Mt. Gerezim near Shechem where a covenant of simple laws was promulgated which Meek thinks is to be found in Deuteronomy 27.[2] This took place as early as the Fourteenth Century.

In the great movement of migrating hordes some broke off to the south and later some pushed on to the borders of Egypt where they settled in Goshen. After the overthrow of the Eighteenth Dynasty oppression began and the Hebrews were again in the desert in the Negeb. Moses became the leader of this southern group and organized a confederacy with Yahweh the tribal god. Following the example of Hoshea he made a covenant with the people in the name of the tribal deity. Then began the movement northward from Horeb and Kadesh to Beersheba and Hebron. Thus we have a double entry into Palestine. The centrally located Joseph tribes came in from the East in Amarna times.[3] Judah probably to be found in the region of southern Palestine as early as the central tribes, rose to prominence in the southern coalition and moved northward after 1200 B. C. The movement of the southern coalition was contemporaneous with that of the sea peoples.

The tribe of Levi probably was the only tribe to engage in the Egyptian sojourn. Upon emergence from Egypt it joined the Southern coalition. Finding other tribes too strong, it gave up its ambitions for political independence and because of its special talents and in the interests of security for itself became attached to the tribe of Judah in a priestly capacity.[4] The tribe of Reuben

---

[1] T. J. Meek, "A Suggested Reconstruction of Hebrew History," A. J. T. XXIV (1920), 209-216.

[2] Ibid., p. 210.

[3] The early date for the entry of the central tribes is supported by archaeological finds at Jerico which indicate that that stronghold could not have fallen much later than the Amarna period. Cf. J. Garstang, "The Fate of Jerico Revealed by the Spade," I. L. N. December 6, 1933, pp. 994ff.

[4] T. J. Meek, "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," A. J. S. L. XXXVII (1920-21), 101ff.

whose independent spirit would not permit acquiescence to the domination of the stronger tribe of Judah early broke away from the coalition and migrated around the Dead Sea to a place of settlement east of the Jordan where it soon passed into oblivion.[1] The concubine tribes in the north of Palestine, Dan, Naphtali, Gad and Asher were in Palestine earlier than the more important central tribes. They maintained a loose connection with the central tribes and only gradually came into the coalition with them. Thus we have before us in all too brief statement the main features of the "divided entry" theory.

Recapitulating, the main features of the "Chicago Hypothesis" may be briefly enumerated as follows: The Hebrews are definitely connected with the great migratory movement westward of the Amarna period.[2] The movement of the Southern group was about two hundred years later. The settlement of Israel two centuries before Judah would thus account for the cultural superiority of the North over the South. Yahweh was the tribal god of the Southern tribe of Judah. Though more or less known to the other tribes it was only gradually that he was adopted by them through the missionary activities of the Levites. Yahweh became the national divinity only with the ascendency of Judah in the time of David.[3] Only a small part of the Hebrews, according to this reconstruction, were in Egypt. Lastly, the position of Moses and Joshua are reversed. Joshua is placed first and connected with the central tribes; Moses is identified as the founder of the Southern coalition and comes on the scene at a later time.

When Yahweh first appears in the Old Testament it is as a tribal god. He is only known among the Habiru tribes as the tribal god of one of their number.[4] Yahweh's history is not definitely

---

[1] Explorations in Edomite territory favor the later date for the Exodus. These show no occupancy of this region from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century. Cf. N. Glueck, "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," B.A.S.O.R. No. 55 (1934), 3ff.

[2] D. C. Luckenbill, "On Israel's Origins," A.J.T. XXII (1918), 24-53.

[3] This is shown by the increase in Yahweh proper names at this time. Cf. G. B. Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names (London: A. and C. Black, 1896).

[4] This assumes that Judah was in this movement but early broke off from the main group and swung off to the South where it mingled with clans in that region.

known. He is of Southern origin, his first connection being with Kadesh and the surrounding neighborhood. His movement from South to North was conterminous with the rise to ascendency of the South. Before the amalgamation of the tribes under David and Solomon, each tribe had its own god.[1] Yahweh was thus the god of the tribe that became dominant in the South, namely, Judah. From this tribe came also the dominant cult and priesthood in the South. So also the North had its prominent deity and cult, that of the bull-worship. As the Northern tribes were won to the confederacy the bull became the confederate deity to be displaced only gradually by Yahwism which was made the religion of the land when the South absorbed its Northern rival under David.

The tenacity of bull worship in the North is shown by the fact that it was reestablished officially by Jeroboam when the North broke away from Judah. But Yahwism had gained considerable footing in the North as shown by its official reestablishment by Jehu. This fact coupled with the precarious state of affairs in Judah in Athaliah's reign were, as we have seen, the chief motivating factors in the work of J.

The first connected record of Israel's past was made by J about the middle of the Ninth Century. This history was not a mere chronicle of events but a genuine rationalization of the past of the various elements which at the writer's time constituted the Hebrew nation. J gathered and coordinated the tribal records and in so doing was more a compiler than a composer. He often incorporated and adapted sources that were non-Yahwistic. In some places his own style was like that of his sources, a fact which sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish what J actually wrote from his source materials. J's great literary task was the unification of tribal traditions of such an obviously varied character.

The above reconstruction of Hebrew history lends support to this phase of the treatment of our problem. If these tribes

---

[1] Cf. T. J. Meek, "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," A. J. S. L. XXXVII (1920-21), 101ff. The author enumerates names that indicate tribal deities. Leah-wild cow, Rachel-ewe, Caleb-dog. Ephraim had the bull deity. Jacob-el, and Joseph-el suggest that Jacob and Joseph were originally god names. Same is true of Isra-el, Ishma-el, Jerahme-el, Jabu-el, Edom, Dan Gad and Asher are god names.

had separate deities Elohim was the name of the deity in their early traditions. A thoroughgoing Yahwist, J seeks to show that the greatness of the nation was solely due to Yahweh's guidance and care. To provide a historical basis for this view he is forced to Yahwize the Northern sources that together with the Judean traditions made up the records of his people's past. J wrote when Yahwism was in temporary eclipse. Judah had been reduced to vassalage by the clever Omri. Looking back upon the past he visualizes the time of David and Solomon as a golden age. His Judean bias cannot be explained, therefore, by present Judean prestige but by the reverse thereof.

This newer historical reconstruction likewise has bearing on the problem of E. Even though the consensus of scholars has been that E was Northern and later than J, a few scholars have thought that some of E was earlier than J. This is easily explainable when we recognize that many traditions used by J were Elohistic and early. Such Elohistic material was never a part of the later E or theocratic strand. This failure to distinguish the earlier and later Elohistic strands has confused the issue of the date of the so-called E stratum. This confusion has resulted from the failure to recognize the non-Yahwistic character of the Northern tribes and their earliest traditions.

According to the foregoing reconstruction, the almost permanent difference in interests between the North and South is understandable. This fact explains, partly at least, why the uniting of the two groups under David was the high spot of the past for J. It explains the almost herculean efforts required for J to bring the past of his people under the sway of the one divinity Yahweh.

The essential accuracy of the "Chicago Hypothesis" forever dispels the idea that the Hebrews came into Palestine as a united band of loyal Yahwists. Their religion was not unlike that of other desert dwellers. Each tribe had its own divinity. If political unification was long and arduous, religious unification was even longer drawn out. As Judah's political star rose so her deity Yahweh gained ground. It follows then that we cannot posit simple beginnings for Israel. Israel's religious contribution did not consist in the development of a germ already present in the desert. Rather, it emerged from the stresses and tensions in the settled life in Palestine. Already in the time of David such a

tension can be observed in the clash of two patterns of culture, one the pattern which David was adopting, that of the autocratic divine kingship and the other a sterner pattern on which Uriah the Hittite models his life. Later we find the prophets ranging themselves against the abuses of this system which David had instituted. But this is not to say that they were not influenced by the system against which they registered such vehement protest. Out of such clashes through the centuries there was painfully molded Israel's rich legacy to the world. On this newer theory Israel's experience becomes all the more wonderful in that it indicates the power of religion to mold out of such disparate elements a homogeneous cultural group.

We may say that on the whole our theory of the literary evolution of J and E and the "Chicago Hypothesis" are mutually supporting.

Briefly summarizing our position, it may be said that our emphasis has been chiefly on the functional aspects of the literature. This functional emphasis has served to carry forward or, perhaps more correctly, to supplement the older literary approach to the problem of J and E.

The tradition established by J has been left by E (theocrat) pretty much as he found it. He sought to modify it not by writing a new history but by an expansion of the currently accepted history. The result was the JE narrative. Both the original Judean History of the Hebrew people and the later JE history appeared in definite historical situations and were written not as scientifically accurate records of the past but were designed to modify and correct certain phases of life which the writers thought needed to be changed.

According to our view, E holds a fundamentally different conception of the way by which Israelite success could be achieved from that of J. J believed thoroughly in the political institution as represented by the Davidic line, whereas E had seen the monarchy decline to such an extent that he not only has no faith in its value but charges it with being the cause of Israel's troubles. His interest is entirely in Israel's distinctive culture. His was a system that would order people's lives in a manner to exclude every practice not acceptable to the will of the deity as revealed in his laws and through his intermedi-

aries.[1]

We have seen that J often incorporated his sources without an idealizing revision. For this reason we sometimes speak of J's naïveté. This is not always due to an unsophisticated attitude on the part of J. Rather, it is due to J's subtle method of criticising the system in which he was beginning to discern meeknesses. David was, of course, J's great hero but he does not hesitate to allow to stand the story of Nathan which reflects discredit on his hero. J did not necessarily approve of all that he allowed to stand in his narrative. He was an enthusiastic Yahwist and sought to show that everything worth while in Hebrew history was due to his inspiration but he did not allow that fact to hide the crude features of the origins of tribal history and the dominant cultus.

Both J and E are universalistic to the extent that the system each visualizes embraces all Israelites in its scope. J looked forward to the time when all Israelites would come again to see the divine favor and grace through the medium of the Davidic house by which Yahweh had established his everlasting covenant with his people. In this, J is probably quite accurate in representing what seem to be the actual views of David himself. For J, the Davidic Covenant was the central fact in Israelite history, because, in that event the nation had its birth. E likewise represents all twelve tribes as entering into the establishment of the Mosaic Covenant. This was the great moment of Israelite history for E. On that occasion the Hebrews were constituted as a distinctive culture group with a divinely given legal system for their government. The Davidic Covenant, of course, has no validity for E. The Mosaic stature was thus raised immeasurably by E, whereas in J, Moses was only one among many delivers raised up in times of crisis who constituted the line leading up to David. In E, Moses is the theocratic lawgiver

---

[1]It may be that Jeremiah became involved in the theocratic movement when, as a youth, he broke with heredity and went up to Jerusalem to give himself to the cause which he thought would yet save the nation. His disillusionment took place when the movement fell into the hands of the court temple group which worked out a compromise with the executive powers resulting in the promulgation of the Deuteronomic code. This revulsion of Jeremiah is probably reflected in Jer. 8: 8.

through whose agency the Hebrews were formed into a culturally unique national entity.

Both J and E are particularistic in the sense that for each the Hebrews are God's chosen people and are the recipients of his special favor and care. Despite the fact that E's system would seem to be capable of a more universal appeal than that of J, he seems at times even more violently particularistic than J. This is seen in his allusions to the practice of the ban at various times in Israelite history. This may be partly explainable on the basis of his prophetic psychology. At least it was expressive of his great alarm at the cultural syncretism occurring in his time. E's is a cultural particularism resulting from the fusion of prophetic idealism and nationalism.

J is more realistic than E in the representation of his historical data. We have only to observe again the treatment by each author of two phases of the history, namely, those of the conquest and the establishment of the monarchy. That E has done great violence to historical fact in both cases goes without saying.

J has, however, done considerable idealizing in his treatment of the early phases of the history. It is due to J as we have seen that we have the organization of the patriarchal legends into their present connected form. His passion for the unity of his people, a central fact in his philosophy of history, underlay his representation of the unity of the twelve tribes from earliest times. The number twelve apart from its well-known character as a symbol of unity was doubtlessly derived from Solomon's division of the country for fiscal purposes. Thus deriving the number twelve, J was prompted to make the connection of Israel's ancestry with the twelve sons of Jacob.

The tradition no doubt long existed of an Egyptian sojourn and has some basis in fact. But, as we have seen, all the evidence points to the presence of but a small group of Israelites in Egypt. J idealizes the situation to the extent of bringing the twelve tribal ancestors into that experience. Naturally he continued this idealization throughout his account of the desert sojourn and the movement around the Dead Sea preparatory to their entry into the promised land. With this his idealization largely ceases, however. It may be that he was too close to later events to modify them extensively or that they did not require modification to suit his

purposes. At any rate, the story of the events surrounding the induction of David into the kingly office needed no change at his hands for those events and their implications were basic in his whole treatment of the rest of the history.

Thus J was the great unifier of Hebrew tradition. The stories and legends that came into his hands must have been of a varied character. But under the theory of a divinely chosen people, divinely appointed leaders and a divinely established government, J accomplished this unification.

Such unification was no less desirable for E's purposes. He carried it even further by representing all the twelve tribes as marching triumphantly to their occupancy of the land that had been promised to the fathers. After the orderly parceling of the land to the victorious invaders, E represents all the tribes as governed by a succession of theocratic judges which period of history culminates in the establishment of the ideal society, the theocracy, under the perfect theocrat Samuel. Everywhere E is thus far less realistic than J.

This unity of tradition may be said to be the most important thing both J and E have in common. In their panoramic view of Hebrew history, it was all Israel they envisaged moving from humble beginnings to the grand consummation, as each conceived it, under the divine aegis.

Both J and E have had profound effect on Hebrew history. Probably the most lasting influence of J is found in the political messianism which he inculcated through his philosophy of history. The fact that the conception of national salvation through an offspring of the Davidic line has so thoroughly pervaded subsequent Hebrew history transmuted though the idea was into a messianism of a purer form, is primarily due to J's literary embodiment of the system which David introduced. On the other hand, it was E who provided the historical basis for the legal ecclesiastical system that was to emerge from the ruins of the fallen monarchy. Although the movement that he represented was soon to be submerged by the Deuteronomic experiment, he was instrumental in smoothing the way for the transition of the Hebrew people from a political to a cultural entity.

The combined tradition JE as it was left by the theocratic editor has provided the basis for that bond of unity which has served to keep the Jewish people a distinctive group through the ages.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A. J. S. L.	American Journal of Semitic Languages
A. J. T.	American Journal of Theology
B. A. S. O. R.	Bulletin American Schools of Oriental Research
Can. J. of Rel. Thought	Canadian Journal of Religious Thought
H. B. D.	Hastings' Bible Dictionary
I. L. N.	Illustrated London News
J. B. L.	Journal of Biblical Literature
J. R.	Journal of Religion
J. T. S.	Journal of Theological Studies
Q. S. P. E. F.	Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Addis, W. E. The Documents of the Hexateuch. London, Vol. I, 1892: Vol. II, 1898.

Albright, Wm. F. The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible. New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1932.

Arnold, W. R. Ephod and Ark. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Astruc, Jean. Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genese, avec des remarques qui appuient ou qui e'claircissent ces conjectures. Bruxelles: Fricx, 1753.

Badé, W. F. The Old Testament in the Light of To-day. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.

Barton, George A. Archaeology and the Bible. Philadelphia: American S. S. Union, 1925.

_____. Semitic and Hamitic Origins. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934.

Bertholet, Alfred. A History of Hebrew Civilization. Trans. Rev. A. K. Dallas, M. A. London: George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., 1926.

Bewer, J. A. The Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

_____. The Religion of the Bible. Chicago: American Institute of Sacred Literature, 1925.

Bleek, Friedrich. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1878.

Bliss, F. J. The Development of Palestine Exploration. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Bodenstein, Andreas Rudolf. (Karlstadt) De Canonicis Scriptoris.

Breasted, J. H. A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1912.

_____. The Dawn of Conscience. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1933.

Briggs, C. A. International Critical Commentary, Psalms. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Brightman, E. S. Sources of the Hexateuch. New York and Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1918.

Brown, Rollo, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1907.

Budde, Karl. Die Bücher Richter und Samuel ihre quellen und ihr aufbau. Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890.

Buhl, Frants P. W. Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments. Trans. Rev. John Macpherson. Edinburgh, 1892.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, and Harford, Battersby George. The Composition of the Hexateuch. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1902.

Chapman, Arthur T. An Introduction to the Pentateuch. Cambridge University Press, 1911.

Clay, A. T. Light on the Old Testament from Babel. Philadelphia: S. S. Times Publishing Co., 1907.

Colenso, J. W. The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined. London: 1862-1871.

Cook, S. A. The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology. London: Oxford University Press, 1930.

De Wette, Wilhelm. Dissertatio Critica. 1805.

_____. A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures. Trans. and Enl. Theodore Parker. Boston: C. C. Little and J. Brown, 1822).

Dillmann, August. Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded. Trans. from last Edition Wm. B. Stevenson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.

Driver, S. R. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1903.

_____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1895.

Duncan, G. Digging Up Bible History. Vol. II, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.

Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. Einleitung ins Alte Testament. Leipsig: Bey Weidmanns erben und Reich, 1787.

Eiselen, F. C. The Books of the Pentateuch. New York and Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1916.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1931.

_____. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.

Ewald, Hermann. The Antiquities of Israel. Trans. Henry S. Solly. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1876.

Fowler, Henry T. The Origin and Growth of Hebrew Religion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916.

_____. A History of the Literature of Ancient Israel from the Earliest Times to 135 B.C. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1922.

Fullerton, Kemper. Prophecy and Authority. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919.

Geddes, Alexander. Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures. Vol. I, Containing Remarks on the Pentateuch. London: Davis, Wilkes & Taylor, 1800.

Graf, Karl H. Die geschichtlichen bücher des Alten Testaments Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866.

Graham, W. C. The Prophets and Israel's Culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Graham, W. C. and May, H. G. Culture and Conscience. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Gray, G. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1908.

_____. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Gressmann, Hugo. Altorientalische texte und bilder zum Alten Testament. Berlin und Leipzig: W. deGruyter & Co., 1926-27.

Gunkel, Herman. Legends of Genesis. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1907.

_____. Israel and Babylon. Trans. Philadelphia, 1904.

Hatcher, Harold O. "'Israel' and 'Judah' as Reflected in the Old Testament Literature Written after the Fall of Samaria." M. A. Thesis. Chicago, 1928.

Hooke, S. H. Myth and Ritual. London: Oxford Press, 1934.

Hupfeld, Herman. Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Tusammensetzung. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853.

Jack, J. W. The Ras Shamra Tablets, Their Bearing on the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1935.

Jerémias, Alfred. The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East. Vol. I, II. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.

Jirku, Anton. Das Weltliche Recht im Alten Testament. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1927.

Johns, Claude H. W. The Relations Between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples. London: Published for the British Academy by H. Milford, 1914.

_____. The Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament. In Swete, H. B. Ed. Cambridge Biblical Essays.

Johnson, A. R. "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," in S. H. Hooke (Ed.), The Labyrinth. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935.

Kennett, R. H. Deuteronomy and the Decalogue. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1920.

_____. Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom as Indicated in Law Narrative and Metaphor. Schweich Lectures. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Kittel, Rudolf. Great Men and Movements in Israel. Trans. C. A. Knoch and C. D. Wright. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929.

Koenig, Eduard. Emleitung in Das Alte Testaments. Bonn: E. Weber, 1893.

Kuenen, A. An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. Trans. London: The Macmillan Co., 1886.

Leslie, Elmer A. Old Testament Religion. New York: Abingdon Press, 1936.

Lewis, Frank G. How the Bible Grew. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.

Lods, Adolphe. Israel. Trans. S. H. Hooke. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1932.

Löhr, Max. Untersuchungen zum Hexateuch Problem. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1924.

Macalister, R. A. S. The Philistines, Their History and Civilization. Schweich Lectures for 1911. London: British Academy, 1914.

Marti, Karl. The Religion of the Old Testament. Trans. G. A. Bienemann. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

McFayden, John E. The Approach to the Old Testament. London: J. Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1926.

Moeller, Wilhelm. Die Einheit und Echtheit der 5 Büches Mosis. Bad Salzaflen: Bibelbund, 1931.

Moore, G. F. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1895.

Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, Theodore H. A History of Israel. Vol. iii. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

_____. Hebrew Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

_____. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934.

Olmstead, A. T. History of Assyria. New York and London: Scribner's Sons, 1923.

_____. History of Palestine and Syria. New York and London: Scribner's Sons, 1931.

Orr, James. The Problem of the Old Testament. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Peake, Arthur. The People and the Book. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.

Pederson, Johannes. Israel, It's Life and Culture. London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1926.

Peters, J. P. The Religion of the Hebrews. Boston and London: Grim & Co., 1914.

Petrie, W. M. Explorations in Sinai. London: J. Murray, 1906.

Phythian, Adams, W. J. The Call of Israel. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Pinches, T. G. The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1902.

Price, I. M. The Monuments and the Old Testament. Christian Culture Press, 1899.

Proksch, Otto. Hexateuch. Leipsig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906.

Renan, Ernst. Studies in Religious History. London: Wm. Heinemann, 1893.

Reuss, Eduard. Die Geschichte der heiligen schriften Alten Testaments. Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1881.

Rogers, R. W. Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1912.

Ryle, H. E. The Canon of the Old Testament. 2d ed. London: The Macmillan Co., Ltd., 1914.

_____. The Early Narratives of Genesis. London: The Macmillan Co., Ltd., 1892.

Sayce, Archibald H. The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1895.

Schrader, Eberhard. Fludien zur Kritik und Erklarung der biblischen urgeschichte. Zurich: Meyer & Zeller, 1863.

Sellin, Ernst. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1923.

Siebens, A. R. L'origine Code Deuteronomique. Paris: E. Leroux, 1929.

Simon, Richard. Historica Critica veteris Testamenti. Paris: 1681-85.

Simpson, D. C. Pentateuchal Criticism. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.

Skinner, John. Divine Names in Genesis. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.

_____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Smith, G. A. Historical Geography of the Holy Land. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.

Smith, H. P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Samuel. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1904.

_____. Old Testament History. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Smith, J. M. P. The Prophets and Their Times. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925.

_____. The Origin and History of Hebrew Law. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931.

_____. The Moral Life of the Hebrews. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923.

de Spinoza, Benedictus. Tractatus Theologico-Politicus. The Chief Works of Benedictus de Spinoza trans. from Latin with an Introduction by R. H. M. Elwes. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1908.

Steuernagel, Carl. Die einwanderung der israelitischen stamme in Kanaan Historisch-Kritische untersuchungen. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1901.

Swend, Rudolf. Die Erzahlung des Hexateuchs auf ihre Quellen Untersucht. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1912.

Welch, Adam C. The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of its Origin. London: J. Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1924.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of the Hebrew People. Trans. J. Sutherland Block and Alan Mengies. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Co., 1892.

_____. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen bücher des Alten Testaments. Berlin: G. Reiner, 1899.

Wiener, Harold M. Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. London: E. Stock, 1910.

_____. Origin of the Pentateuch. London: E. Stock, 1912.

Volz, Paul and Rudolf, Wilhelm. Der Elohist als Erzahler ein irrweg der Pentateuch Kritik. Giessen: A Töpelmann, 1933.

Articles

Albright, W. F. "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," B.A.S.O.R. No. 58, 1935.

Fullerton, Kemper. "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future," J.B.L., XL-XLI (1921-22), 1f.

Garstang, J. "The Fate of Jericho Revealed by the Spade," I.L.N., December 16, 1933, pp. 994ff.

Graham, W. C. "Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy," J.R., VII (1927), 396-418.

_____. "New Light on the Cultural Origins of the Hebrews," J. R., XIV (1934), 306f.

_____. "Isaiah's Part in the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis," A.J.S.L., L (1934), 201f.

Hooke, S. H. "The Cultural Value of the Old Testament," Church Quarterly Review, CXX (1935), 189f.

Kautzsch, E. "Religion of Israel," H.B.D. Extra Vol., pp. 612-734.

Kennett, R. H. "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," J.T.S., VI, 161-186.

Koenig, Eduard. "Judges," H.B.D., II, 809-820.

Luckenbill, D. D. "On Israel's Origins," A.J.T., XXII (1918), 24-53.

May, H. G. "The Evolution of the Joseph Story," A.J.S.L., XLVII (1931), 87f.

Meek, T. J. "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," A.J.S.L., XXXVII (1920-21), 101f.

_____. "Canticles and Tammuz Cult," A.J.S.L., XXXIX (1922), 1f.

_____. "A Suggested Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History," A.J.T., XXIV (1920), 209-216.

_____. "Some Old Testament Problems in the Light of Recent Archaeological Discoveries," Can.J. of Rel. Thought Vol. VI, 1929.

Murison, R. G. "The Serpent in the Old Testament," A.J.S.L., XXI (1905), 115ff.

Paton, L. B. "Israel's Conquest of Canaan," J.B.L., XXXII (1913), 1-53.

Phythian, Adams W. J. "Israel in the Arabah," Q.S.P.E.F., XLV (1933), 137ff.

"The Problem of Deuteronomy: A Symposium," J.B.L., (1928), 305-379.

Ryle, H. E. "Genesis," H.B.D., II, 143-148.

Smith, J. M. P. "Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion," A.J.S.L., XXXII (1915-16), 81f.

_____. "Southern Influence on Hebrew Prophecy," A.J.S.L., XXXV (1918), 1-19.

_____. "Palestinian Archaeology and Religion," A.J.S.L., Vol. XLVIII, 1932.

Virolleaud, M. "Les inscriptions cuneiforms de Ras Shamra," Syria, X (1929), 304ff.

Waterman, Leroy, "Bull-Worship in Israel," A.J.S.L., (1915), 229-255.

Wood, W. Carleton. "The Religion of Canaan," J.B.L., XXXV (1916), 1-163, 163-280.

END

Microfilmed by
Department of Photoduplication
The University of Chicago Library
Swift Hall
Chicago 37, Illinois

FURTHER REPRODUCTION OF,
OR QUOTATION FROM, THIS
MATERIAL MAY NOT BE MADE
WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM
THE AUTHOR AND DEPARTMENT
GRANTING THE DEGREE.

Thesis No. T11658